

CHURCH HISTORY

MARCH, 1968

Images of Religion in America

Jerald C. Brauer

Christ Columbus and James Oglethorpe

Arthur Vööbus

Friedrich II and the Church

James M. Powell

Book Printing in Florence

Martin Anton Schmidt

Wyclif and Biblical Authority

William Mallory

Arthur J. G. Rees, 1956-1958

John Dillenberger

John Wesley (1703-1791)

Winthrop S. Hudson

with Comment by

Leo Strauss



THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFY, 1888; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT
OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916.

OFFICERS FOR 1961

Harold J. Grimm	President	James H. Smylie	Asst. Sec.
Lefferts A. Loetscher	Vice-President	Guy S. Klett	Treasurer
Robert S. Michalson	Secretary	James H. Nichols	Editors
(School of Religion, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa)		Frederick A. Norwood	

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Quirinus Aron	Jerald C. Brauer
H. Shelton Smith	Raymond W. Albright
George H. Williams	Albert C. Outler
Robert T. Handy	E. Harris Harrison

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Henry B. Washburn	Percy V. Norwood
Winifred E. Garrison	Kenneth S. Latourette
Conrad H. Moehmann	Matthew Spinka
Frederick W. Loetscher	Cyril W. Richardson
John T. McNeill	Carl E. Schneider
Wilhelm Pauck	Ernest G. Schwiebert
Massey H. Shepherd	Ray C. Petry
Roland H. Bairston	Sandford Fleeming
E. R. Hardy, Jr.	Sidney E. Mead
Harold S. Bender	Leonard J. Trinterud

Subscription prices are five dollars a year, one dollar and a half for single copies. Twenty-five cents a year should be added for foreign countries. Remittances should be made to the order of the American Society of Church History. Subscriptions, renewals, changes of address, claims for missing numbers, orders for single copies of current or back issues should be addressed to Guy S. Klett, Presbyterian Historical Society, 520 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania. Claims for missing numbers will be honored without charge if made within two months following the regular date of publication.

Manuscripts and books for review should be sent to the editorial office, 506 Swift Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

The articles in *Church History* are indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*.

Microfilm reproductions of *Church History*, beginning with Volume XVIII, are available to subscribers and to members of the Society from University Microfilms, 315 North Zeeb Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The Publication Office is in Berne, Indiana.

Entered as second class matter March 9, 1964, at the post-office at Berne, Indiana, under the Acts of March 3, 1879.

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and F. A. NORWOOD

with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (*Divinity School, Yale University*)

R. PIERCE BEAVER (*Divinity School, University of Chicago*)

ROBERT GRANT (*Divinity School, University of Chicago*)

WINTHROP S. HUDSON (*Colgate-Rochester Divinity School*)

SIDNEY E. MEAD (*Southern California School of Theology*)

RAY C. PETRY (*Divinity School, Duke University*)

MATTHEW SPINKA (*Hartford Theological Seminary, Emeritus*)

WILHELM PAUCK (*Union Theological Seminary*)

JOHN DILLENBERGER (*Divinity School, Drew University*)

EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR. (*Princeton Theological Seminary*)

VOL. XXX

MARCH, 1961

NO. 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IMAGES OF RELIGION IN AMERICA

Jerald C. Brauer - - - - - 3

THE INSTITUTION OF THE *Benai Qeiam* AND *Benat Qeiam* IN THE ANCIENT SYRIAN CHURCH

Arthur Vööbus - - - - - 19

FREDERICK II AND THE CHURCH IN THE KINGDOM OF SICILY 1220-1224

James M. Powell - - - - - 28

THE PROBLEM OF PAPAL PRIMACY AT THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE

Martin Anton Schmidt - - - - - 35

JOHN WYCLIF AND THE TRADITION OF BIBLICAL AUTHORITY

William Mallard - - - - - 50

MAJOR VOLUMES AND SELECTED PERIODICAL LITERATURE IN LUTHER STUDIES, 1956-1959

John Dillenger - - - - - 61

CONTENTS

THE WEBER THESIS REEXAMINED <i>Winthrop S. Hudson</i>	88
COMMENT ON THE WEBER THESIS REEXAMINED <i>Leo Strauss</i>	100
SURVEY: EUROPEAN ARCHIVAL RESOURCES FOR THE STUDY OF CALIFORNIA CATHOLIC HISTORY <i>John Bernard McGloin, S. J.</i>	103
DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS	106
THE NEGOTIATIONS OF CLEMENT VII AND FRANCIS I	W. J. Stierer
THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLITIQUE THOUGHT	E. M. Beame
LIBERAL CATHOLICISM IN FRANCE, 1843-1870	J. K. Huckaby
THE RECEPTION OF DARWINISM IN THE UNITED STATES	E. J. Pfeifer
THE LIFE AND WORK OF PHINEAS F. BRESEE	D. P. Brickley
THE MISSION COMPOUND IN MODERN CHINA	G. R. Quale
BOOK REVIEWS	112
CORWIN, VIRGINIA: <i>St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch</i>	Edward Rochie Hardy
GILL, JOSEPH, S. J.: <i>The Council of Florence</i>	Deno John Geanakoplos
TAVARD, GEORGE H.: <i>Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation</i>	Eugene R. Fairweather
CHMAJ, LUDWIK, ed.: <i>Studia nad Arianizmem</i>	Wiktor Weintraub
SOCYN, FAUST: <i>Listy</i> . Ed. by LUDWIK CHMAJ	Joseph Alen
MEYER, CARL S.: <i>Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559</i>	P. M. Dawley
BIEN, DAVID D.: <i>The Calas Affair. Persecution, Toleration, and Heresy in Eighteenth Century Toulouse</i>	Margaret Maxwell
KENNY, TERENCE: <i>The Political Thought of German Methodism</i>	Carl E. Schneider
FURNISS, NORMAN F.: <i>The Mormon Conflict 1850-1859</i>	Marvin S. Hill
ARDEN, G. E.: <i>The School of the Prophets. The Background and History of Augustana Theological Seminary 1860-1960</i>	Gene Lund
NELSON, E. CLIFFORD and FEVOLD, EUGENE L.: <i>The Lutheran Church Among Norwegian-Americans</i>	Gerhard L. Belgum
MEYER, DONALD B.: <i>The Protestant Search for Political Realism, 1919-1941</i>	Paul A. Carter
ACTIVITIES AND PROJECTS	128

IMAGES OF RELIGION IN AMERICA*

JERALD C. BRAUER, *Divinity School, University of Chicago*

In recent years, it has become fashionable in scholarly and journalistic circles to employ the image concept as a means of describing and interpreting historical, political, or social realities. A number of attempts have been made recently to sketch the picture or to present the image of America. It is both interesting and puzzling that the image concept should be so widely employed; yet it is, in some sense, understandable. We live in an era of communications through images. We are confronted by them on all sides through the media of mass communication such as television, press, billboards, and radio. Professor Daniel Boorstin recently pointed out that our age is dominated not by ideas but by images. This has had already and will have increasingly momentous consequences both for our national self-understanding and for our stance before the world.

However it is not the purpose of this paper to pursue the intriguing and important problem of the emergence, nature and adequacy of the image concept. In the face of a rapid sophistication in the employment of this concept, I should prefer to use the term in its simple form. During the nineteenth century, a large number of non-clerical visitors came to American shores in order to observe firsthand the new developments in an enigmatic but exciting young nation. Many visitors wished to share their comments and insights with their fellow countrymen. Others wished to make serious observations on American customs or institutions. Each, in his own way, developed an image of what America was for him and sought to convey that image to Europeans. This image was a written representation, a picture sketched by pen but drawn through the forms of observation, imagination, and analysis.

None of the non-clerical Europeans studied for this paper were concerned to present a picture of religious life alone. In fact, all of them were interested only in the broader picture of the total American scene or in one of the great fundamental institutions within the new nation. Nevertheless, every European observer of note made some observations on the role of religion in American life. Several devoted extensive space to a description and analysis of the religious scene. They asserted, with accuracy, that they were painting a picture of American life as it was—with religion at the center of that picture.

Such observations are of special value for the church historian's attempt to understand the nature and development of Christianity in

*Presidential address, delivered before the American Society of Church History, December 29, 1960, in New York City.

the American scene. It is amazing how consistently these images coincide with the generalizations and interpretations developed by our contemporary church historians. In order to document this fact, a large portion of this paper will be devoted to an analysis of the key insights that comprise the images of religion in America as seen by Europeans. Also, brief comments will be offered concerning both the inadequacy of these images and their continued usefulness for church historians. The fact that these insights come from a totally different perspective permits them to serve better both as a corroboration and a correction for the church historian.

Two key motifs dominate the various European images of religion in America, and both were discerned by De Tocqueville when he stated, "Upon my arrival in the United States, the religious aspect of the country was the first thing that struck my attention; and the longer I stayed there, the more did I perceive the great political consequences resulting from this state of things, to which I was unaccustomed."¹

That to which he and all other Europeans were unaccustomed was religious liberty or separation of church and state. The other surprise for which he was unprepared was the extent to which this condition of separation worked an opposite effect from that anticipated. He was struck by the centrality of the religious life for the people and for the mores, and he perceived gradually that it had tremendous political consequences. All sensitive visitors made these same observations throughout the nineteenth century.

The first motif, religious liberty, did not receive as much space or emphasis in the various pictures of America. It was always stated, and an effort was made to point out how utterly strange this was for a European. In some sense, this was an unavoidable fact. Europeans had lived through fifteen hundred years of church establishment, so they could think of no other form in which the church could be embodied. At most, they had wrestled with the idea of a gentleman-like establishment in which there would be a minimal toleration for other groups.

Several observers sketched out how this condition came to prevail, but most were content merely to state the bald fact of religious liberty as part of the great American experiment. Philip Schaff, a clergyman, if it is legitimate to count him as a European observer, briefly outlined the development of religious liberty in America when, in the 1850's, he presented in Germany a series of lectures on America. It was in this early picture of the American scene that he first made clear the fact that there was no option open to Congress except religious liberty. All church historians built on his subsequent state-

ment that Congress was "shut up" to the course of religious liberty.

However, it was not the massive fact of religious liberty itself that struck the European observers. They were far more impressed with its consequences. Visitors came prepared for the worst. A few, such as Mrs. Trollope, found it without searching, but all fair-minded and shrewd observers discovered things totally unexpected. What they discovered became the center of their picture of religion in the American scene, and for some it became the key to understanding the totality of American life. They discovered that religious liberty did not undercut financial support of the churches, destroy a sufficient clergy, breed atheism among the masses, or subvert the moral foundations of the nation. On the contrary, they observed that under the conditions of religious liberty the American experiment produced a people and a culture, including politics, in which religion and morality were absolutely central.

Francis Grund spoke eloquently and typically for many European observers when he said: "Religion has been the basis of the most important American settlements; religion kept their little community together, religion assisted them in their revolutionary struggle; it was religion to which they appealed in defending their rights, and it was religion, in fine, which taught them to prize their liberties. It is with the solemnities of religion that the Declaration of Independence is yet annually read to the people from the pulpit, or that Americans celebrate the anniversaries of the most important events in their history. It is to religion they have recourse whenever they wish to impress the popular feeling with anything relative to their country; and it is religion which assists them in all their national undertakings. The Americans look upon religion as a promoter of civil and political liberty; and have, therefore, transferred to it a large portion of the affection which they cherish for the institutions of their country."²

He then pointed to the role of morality and its relation to Christianity by stating that "the deference which the Americans pay to morality is scarcely inferior to their regard for the Christian religion, and is considered to be based upon the latter. The least solecism in the moral conduct of a man is attributed to his want of religion, and is visited upon him as such."³

A number of Europeans who noted the unusually close connection between morality and politics in American life were driven to ask the question why. The fact of religious liberty appeared to provide one answer; however, that in itself was not sufficient. In theory, it should have driven religion completely out of American life and undercut all general morality. Something was operative that blocked the theory and produced an opposite result.

Two primary factors were given credit for the reversal of theory. The first, the removal of religion from the political realm, was skillfully developed by both De Tocqueville and Francis Grund. The second, the Puritan strain of religious consciousness, was alluded to by several authors but, unfortunately, never fully developed. De Tocqueville emphasized equality in American life as a deciding factor in helping religion maintain its decisive role in American society. Equality does help to explain how there was a decided shift from religion as a political requirement to religion as a social requirement in the American scene.

De Tocqueville also pointed out that, in America, religion aided in the struggle for independence and helped bring the new society into existence; therefore, it was closely allied to the central habits of the nation.⁴ It helped to produce the conditions that resulted in religious liberty and came to appreciate this as the most advantageous of all arrangements. Even a Roman Catholic clergy in America concurred in this judgment. But this, in itself, cannot account for the phenomenal success of religion in America.

Probably the formative factor is that by losing its life as an establishment, religion in America gained both its religious and its political life. By seeking first its spiritual good, all other things were added unto it.⁵ So argue Grund and De Tocqueville. They grant that religion exercises but little direct influence on laws and on the details of public opinion in America, but by concentrating on the manners and mores of the community and of domestic life, it regulates the state. This was the way it appeared to the early nineteenth-century European observer, and it was undoubtedly so.

This achieved several distinct advantages for the churches, the Europeans argued. For example, it raised the doctrines of Christianity above the ebb and flow of political arguments and political parties. Law could and would be changed, parties would ascend and fall, but Christianity retained its stronghold in the public mind, unshaken by the vicissitudes of party political strife. By embracing separation of church and state in a democratic society, religion was enabled to live in a new situation and to assume a leading role in the whole of social and political life.

One of the ways religion achieved this eminence was through its inculcation of morality in individuals and in society. Most Europeans were astonished by the fact that under the conditions of separation of church and state and under the prohibition of religious tests for public federal offices, there was a powerful unwritten law pervasively at work.⁶ All candidates had to exhibit impeccable personal moral lives, insofar as that could be discerned, and no candidate

could deny the importance of religion for the public welfare. Such a requirement was impossible of achievement in European religious establishments.

Grund makes quite clear that in America "private virtue oversteps the highest qualifications in the mind" for public office or simply for general acceptance in the public mind.⁷ Only the person practicing certain ethical standards derived from the contemporary Protestant pietistic interpretation of Christianity is truly trustworthy in society. Suddenly, religion has shifted ground—it is no longer directly a political necessity; it is a necessity for the welfare of society. Also, in America, society is prior to and more fundamental than the state; therefore, a social necessity is more powerful or influential than that which is simply a political necessity.

It is recognized by the Europeans that this state of affairs presents a number of difficulties, but, on the whole, they are pleased by what they see—religion and morality flourish and the experiment in political liberty proceeds with orderliness in achieving remarkable progress in a short time. Religion provided the necessary tradition and stability which made the democratic experiment possible. Most of the observers did not doubt this. The lack of inherited responsibilities, of the balance wheel of the aristocracy, and of the multi-form institutions of state and society had to be remedied by some force or institutions in American life. Religion played that role. By removing it from political life, it could become the unitive, stable force undergirding all social life.

So religion in America became instrumental in nature and indispensable for the national welfare. It could do this because it had full freedom to indulge in doctrinal disputes within its own circle while, at the same time, all groups were busily engaged in disseminating basic Christian morality throughout the new, young nation. Most European purveyors of images expressed sentiments comparable to De Tocqueville when he said that the many aspects in America "differ in respect to the worship which is due from man to his Creator, but they all agree in respect to the duties which are due from man to man. Each sect adores the Deity in its own peculiar manner, but all the sects preach the same moral law in the name of God."

It is this morality that soon became the common law of the land, and to dispense with that "would not only shake the foundation of society, but eventually subvert the government."⁹ It was not only the New England divines and the frontier missionaries¹⁰ who thought that religion was essential for the maintenance of the republic, but sophisticated European scholars and travelers came to the same conclusion. Perhaps all of them were so astonished at the

continued successes and stability of the brash young republic that they had to affirm supernatural causes. However, their observations were probably correct purely on sociological and political grounds.

Irreligion could not be tolerated. Under the law it had to be, and was, legally permissible, but an openly avowed agnostic had little chance to win office and influence people.¹¹ Even the doubter had to admit the public importance of religion, then he too would be trustworthy. What the foreign observers did not detect was the ongoing struggle in the American scene between those who insisted on grounding such morality in revealed truth and those who insisted that it was available through reason and human experience. Neither denied the centrality and necessity of the commonly accepted moral code, but they disagreed violently on its source and maintenance. Most European observers, including De Tocqueville, assumed the necessity and role of revelation as conveyed through the historic churches.

Thus, there early developed the amalgamation of the Christian faith and its morality with the democratic faith of the American people. So closely were these fused in history that they produced what contemporary historians call the American faith. It was widely held by the American people throughout the nineteenth century and well into the present century. Virtually all Americans then and many Americans now would agree with Grund's sentiment when he said: "Change the domestic habits of the Americans, their religious devotion, and their high respect for morality, and it will not be necessary to change a single letter of the Constitution in order to vary the whole form of their government. The circumstances being altered, the same causes would no longer produce the same effects; and it is more than probable, that the disparity which would then exist between the laws and the habits of those whom they are destined to govern, would not only make a different government desirable, but absolutely necessary, to preserve the nation from ruin."

The images of religion in America further developed the implications of religious liberty by asserting that an additional consequence was a more thoroughly churchied nation. Because ministers were on their own and congregations had to seek their own financial support, they had to produce or die. Strangely enough, most European commentators thought highly of this. There were more ministers, more churches, and more people in churches. What was lacking in quality, some thought, was made up in quantity. Furthermore, this situation compelled the minister to deal directly with the people. By the very nature of the situation, the ministers could not ignore

their people or their needs. Hence, religion in America is concerned with not only the future life but very much with the life of people here and now. Herein is to be found one of the several bases for activism in the American churches.

Unfortunately, no European observer plumbed a similar depth in analyzing the role of the religious heritage or the nature of Christian experience in accounting for the triumph of religion under the conditions of religious liberty. All mention it in passing, so it becomes a part of the image, but at best it remains only a streak of light in the foreground.

In commenting on the moral vigor of the American people, W. L. George credited this to the Puritan tradition through which America "created in her own mind an aristocracy of God-fearing men and women. She still tends to estimate people according to their morals."¹³ Hugo Munsterberg also recognized that religion never could have shifted from being a political requirement to becoming a social obligation unless there had been a "deep religious consciousness living in the people . . . a religiously inclined population."¹⁴ He traces this strain to the New England Puritans. Perhaps church historians should not expect too much at this point. Europeans generally recognized the importance of the religious forces; they did not bother to analyze them.

On the other hand, De Tocqueville exhibited his superior perceptive powers in posing several basic questions concerning the role of religion under democracy and religious liberty. These questions are again being posed by W. Herberg, S. Mead, H. R. Niebuhr, and a number of other historians. It is remarkable that De Tocqueville raised them so early in the nineteenth century. However, he did not raise these simply as questions; he made certain observations concerning the state of religion in America and he deduced certain conclusions based on particular assumptions concerning equality and democracy. In some of these he proved wrong both for his own day and for the future. In other comments, he demonstrated a rare capacity to diagnose correctly the directions in which Christianity in America would move.

De Tocqueville was correct in noting the paradoxical consequences of equality in a democratic society and in discerning certain reflections of this in religious life. Equality led to the simultaneous tendencies to the elevation of human reason in the autonomy of the individual and to the prohibition of autonomous thought by the opinions and the will of the majority. He shrewdly pointed out the consequences of the latter for Christianity in America, but he did not discern the former operating along with it.

In a remarkable way, he developed the concept of the unquestioned basis of religion for American culture. Because Christianity gave birth to Anglo-American society, it is fused with all the habits of the nation. Removed from the political sphere, it has not been subject to the basic inquiry of society.¹⁵ Nobody has to defend it nor dare attack it. It is believed without discussion; therefore, many of its moral insights are taken for granted by all society and form the basis of that society. Hence, Christianity is held, either implicitly or explicitly, by the vast majority of individuals in American society.

De Tocqueville then correlates this insight with his views on the consequence of equality for majority opinion. If equality drives each man to assert the sufficiency of his own reason against external principles of authority, and if he finds the exercise of his reason sufficient to meet his practical daily needs, he still requires some final court of appeal in which he can test his reason. Ultimately, he argues, a democratic society will locate this in the will of the majority. Common opinion becomes the arbiter and judge. Because the majority of the people hold the Christian faith, or at least its morality, implicitly or explicitly, this majority provides the unquestioned basis guaranteeing its acceptance by the members of society. To go against public opinion on this matter would be a foolish act in the American democratic society.

With keen insight De Tocqueville notes certain derivative elements in the image of religion in America. For one thing, he points out that just as Americans adopt many theories on philosophy, morals, and politics on public trust, without inquiry, so too "religion herself holds sway there, much less as a doctrine of revelation than as a commonly received opinion."¹⁶ Furthermore, he is convinced that this is known and understood by the American clergy, who never take on any but absolutely necessary conflicts with the opinions of the majority. The result is that religion retains the full support of public opinion.¹⁷

De Tocqueville foresees basic difficulties for American society on this point when he says: "Faith in public opinion will become a species of religion there, and the majority its ministering prophet." Several of these predictions appear to be actualized in the American religious scene if the generalizations concerning organization men are at all applicable to the churches. A vast number of complicating factors have intervened between De Tocqueville's age and ours; nevertheless, the American faith in faith, the identification of American morality with the Christian faith, the public acceptance of this general religiousness—all of these derive, in part, from the factors which he outlined. The ease with which Protestant evangelical-pietistic

Christianity merged into and became identified with the American faith rests in part upon the prevalence of equality in the American scene. Its influence was felt both in politics and in religion.

In one important aspect, De Tocqueville's picture of religion in America and its future was incorrect. He was convinced that in a democratic society where equality of conditions prevails, and instinctive disbelief in the supernatural will occur. Men will look to themselves, to their reason, and their experience to judge things aright; thus, they will develop a suspicion of all modern prophets, will "not easily give credence to divine missions" and certainly would establish no new religions.¹⁸ He was undoubtedly correct in observing a new emphasis placed upon human reason and experience as an arbiter in all matters, including religious affairs. This did have vast consequences for Protestantism in America and did, at times, conflict with the other factor, public opinion, as the final arbiter. But it did not prevent the appearance of new religions, nor did it discourage the activity of modern prophets or heap abuse on special divine missions. On the contrary, nineteenth-century American Protestantism produced several new religions with their own modern prophets with special divine missions. Revelation was encountered in many ways through many forms and believed by large numbers of people.

Several things produced consequences in a direction opposite to that anticipated by DeTocqueville. First, the molding power of public opinion in religion was stronger than even he had observed and anticipated. It actually outweighed or gave form to the new-found emphasis on individual reason and experience. The latter did not undercut the possibility of founding new religions because reason could not operate easily beyond the bounds made possible by public opinion. Thus, as he observed, religion, including modern prophets, really went unquestioned. The bounds of the religiously possible were never really discussed at depth or with consistency by the new-found instrument of reason. Where it was tried, in early nineteenth-century deism, it ran aground against public opinion rallied by the churches.

Also, solitary reason had sufficient problems to handle in all other aspects of life without tackling the ultimate questions of religion. It exercised itself on politics, economics, personal and national survival, on the frontier, on education, and on a host of other issues. As De Tocqueville pointed out, all cultures have an unquestioned bedrock on which they build. They cannot raise questions pertaining to every aspect of life. Involved in a vigorous effort to subdue the wilderness and to plant a society, the democratic citizen had neither the time nor the inclination to question the nature and role of revelation in religion. In fact, he found it necessary to leave

it unquestioned. So, there were many examples of religious prophets acclaimed, divine missions believed in, and several new religions established. These forces plus the religious heritage of the American people coalesced to produce a strange combination of the free exercise of reason and a basic anti-intellectualism which has since marked Christianity in America. This one key aspect of the image of religion in America was apparently missed by the most astute of all observers.

Thus, a wide variety of European observers painting their images of religion in America developed as their two central and coordinate themes, religious liberty and the beneficial consequences of this for both political and religious life in America. As they worked out these two themes, they developed generalizations that are almost identical with the standard interpretations employed by church historians today. But they did not complete their pictures with these two themes. Almost all European visitors were equally struck by the sheer activity in the American churches and the full participation of the laity. This, too, was quite unlike their European experience. Mrs. Trollope detested the hustle and bustle of the clergy and laity alike and concluded it was hardly dignified or worthy of the Christian religion. Almost all other observers were impressed by this activism and sought reasons to explain it.

No single observer presented a coherent and consistent explanation. They usually pointed to the reality and supplied several comments. It is possible, however, to piece together a fairly convincing explanation drawn from a variety of insights provided by Grund, Munsterberg, Raeder, De Tocqueville and others. None of them sought an explanation in the nature of the religious faith professed by believers. Perhaps they thought this was the preserve of the church historians. All of them agreed that American society *in toto* was marked by a tumultuous activity and "incessant excitement" that "gives to the Americans an air of busy inquietude, for which they have often been pitied by Europeans; but which . . . constitutes their principal happiness."¹⁸ The churches simply participate in this restless activity and seek to employ it to their ends.

To carry out this activity and to achieve their goals of action, Americans founded countless associations and organizations. In a society based on the equality of all individuals and not on the power of government, people have freedom to pursue their particular and collective goals; therefore they must band together to achieve these goals beyond the capacity of any individual. Thus, the whole of American society is engaged in associations to pursue a wide variety of goals. The churches are not an exception to this but the best example of it. Francis Grund and De Tocqueville noted the tremendous num-

ber of associations created by the churches, functioning both in and outside of the churches to achieve the moral goals of religion as understood and practiced in America. The churches themselves are such associations under the system of religious liberty. It is this insight which Professor Mead has developed so persuasively in his analysis of the church in America as a denomination, a new form over against the older church or sect concepts.

If the churches themselves exist in America to achieve specific goals determined both by their nature and by the action they carry on, then churches are bound to exhibit activity beyond anything previously witnessed in Christian history. De Tocqueville is convinced that a further impetus to activism is given by the amalgamation of religion and patriotism in the American scene. This is but another facet of the unusual relation that exists between religion and society in America. He refers to "missionaries of Christian civilization" who seek to preserve liberty by extending the sway of the Christian religion in the new western states. These are the New Englanders and circuit riders, who sought to Christianize the West, of whom De Tocqueville said that in them, "you meet with a politician when you expect to find a priest."²⁰

The churches reflected the activist nature of society in their own special ways. Munsterberg spoke for a number of other Europeans when he commented on the this-worldly bent of the sermons. The minister usually spoke on a topic of immediate concern to his members. The similes and metaphors were borrowed from every-day and frequently from vulgar life. Anecdotes were freely used and given in colloquial form. The whole purpose of the sermon appeared to be an attempt to confront the person in the midst of his daily vexations, problems, and possibilities. The sermon was geared for immediate response and action in daily affairs.

Also the Europeans were aware of dimensions in churchly activity not usually found in their home lands. Churches in America, on the frontier, in villages, or in the cities, functioned as social clubs. They carried on a wide variety of activities, such as meals, libraries, picnics, raffles, social games, lecture circles, church clubs, schools for children, and a host of other activities. To a European, much of this appeared secular, or even ridiculous in the eyes of a Mrs. Trollope.

But most Europeans understood that the churches had "woven themselves by countless threads into the web of daily life." Consequently, they exemplified the activism of American society more fully than any other institution, including politics. Europeans were amazed at the achievement of this activist spirit as it molded the fundamental character of nineteenth-century American society. They

were particularly impressed and, at times, depressed by the pervasiveness of the American Sabbath day. Grund thought it the most democratic of all Christian institutions because all aristocratic distinctions of birth or commercial achievement were leveled. He was surprised by its hold on the American society. Europeans were equally astonished at the achievements of temperance work, Sunday school activity, societies for moral reform, and the other benevolent associational achievement in America. Truly, activism was a distinctive mark of religion in America.

Revivalism also caught the attention of the Europeans, especially the Continentals. They understood revivalism to be something unusual and definitive about religion in America. Many of them wrote elaborate reports on camp meetings or on revivals in city churches. Munsterberg saw it as a stimulation of the emotions that filled a void in the lives of the masses. Deprived of the splendor of monarchical celebrations, lacking the stimulation of Roman Catholic pomp and drama, caught in a drab and hard life of complete or relative isolation, revivalism provided people with relief from deadening reality. So spoke Munsterberg the psychologist.

De Tocqueville saw the sociological beyond the psychological in this segment of the image. He sensed that people endured hardship and deprivation on the frontier because they lived in perpetual hope. They were very much oriented toward the future achievement of their wants. He was pleased with the fact that people turned their attention away from promoting only their worldly welfare in the new world to a concern for their eternal welfare in the world to come. He was convinced that a most effective truce was worked out between these two drives, and he saw revivalism and the circuit rider as the forces that maintained the necessary balance between the two. It was in his discussion of revivalism that he noted the presence in American society of men filled with a prophetic enthusiasm unmatched in Europe. Here, too, he noted the emergence of peculiar sects on the American scene.

All European observers, therefore, counted revivalism as one of the basic motifs in the American religious image. Unfortunately, they offered little in the way of interpretation or analysis of the phenomenon. They did not seek to understand the nature of revivalism, its sources in the Christian faith and its development in the American scene. They alluded to the fact that it provided a means of winning people to the churches, but they never developed this insight that became so central in Professor Sweet's interpretation of revivalism. It is surprising that De Tocqueville did not attempt to understand it as a natural means through which a vast public

could express its deepest feelings about religion—a great equalizer with a basic common denominator of experience. This would be a most fruitful line of inquiry to pursue within the context of De Tocqueville's framework of interpretation—the impact of equality on religious life in America.

A fourth facet of the images of religion in America is encountered in most of the European observations. The presence of limitless space with vast untouched resources is pointed up as a fundamental reality in American experience. These men knew nothing of a frontier hypothesis, but they were fully aware that the experiences of Europeans in a primeval forest did something to the Europeans and culture. Crèvecoeur, who wrote most extensively on this, saw the experience as psychologically and physically transforming. He wrote of the creation of fear and uncertainty in the minds of those who face the endless forest with its unknown enemies. He also idealized it as the opportunity for a self-sustaining cleansing life that produced industry, honesty, and contentment.

De Tocqueville saw the frontier as an elemental fact in social experience—an opportunity to begin life over without first going through the horrors and excesses of revolution. The presence of a virgin continent to conquer provided the Americans with the necessary locale to attempt the great experiment of liberty and equality.

Both Europeans saw consequences for the religious life. The frontier made possible the development of every conceivable sect without creating open warfare in American society. Crèvecoeur likens religious zeal to gunpowder in an enclosed situation in Europe where it inevitably explodes. In America, it evaporates in the limitless space or burns harmlessly in the open air. He was convinced that this situation promoted a healthy indifference that eliminated all nonessentials in religion and forced the teaching of the bare essentials. These sounded suspiciously like the basic moral virtues that all Europeans agreed undergirded American society.

The final touches on the images of religion in America are provided by a confluence of factors that are clearly interdependent and, perhaps, even interchangeable. Most Europeans noted that American life, including religion, was deeply colored by an anti-historical tendency, and at the same time it was oriented to the present and was perfectionistic. Again, De Tocqueville provides most of the insights, but others commented on these facts as well.

The Frenchman traced the presence of all these factors in American life primarily to equality, but he also understood that religion helped produce and reflected these qualities. Aristocracy, he argued, always upholds the position and place of given religions, and pre-

disposes the mind to accept one particular faith. It holds tradition in highest esteem and is inclined to place intermediate powers between God and man. Thus it must employ history and the arts as media through which tradition is carried and through which mediation between God and man occurs. In America, for several reasons, democracy and equality did not undercut religion; however, they did simplify it and diverted attention from all mediation and secondary agents to the Supreme Power itself. Thus was produced a distinctive aversion to the past, to that which is ancient. Attention turned to the present, to man in his concrete situation. However, what he did not observe was the consequent humanizing of the divine through an unrelenting pressure to confine the divine to an ethical dimension.

A corollary of the anti-historical attitude was belief in the perfectibility of man. This arose from two primary sources and made its impact on every phase of life. Equality engendered a belief in the autonomy of individual reason. Experience proved that reason can be improved and developed in individuals and in society. Why should it not be capable of infinite improvement? Furthermore, as man tests, discards, and refines his goals and ideals, "an image of an ideal perfection, forever on the wing, presents itself to the human mind." This image undergoes refinement and improvement; hence, man himself must be "endowed with an indefinite faculty of improvement."

De Tocqueville made the point that religion in America never contradicted the basic ideals held by the majority of the public if those ideals did not undercut the faith; thus, it was only too easy for religious beliefs in the American scene to coalesce with the anti-historical, perfectionistic, present-oriented tendencies of public opinion. It is difficult to determine whether the particular form of religious belief present at that moment hastened the adoption of these ideas by the majority or whether these beliefs held by the majority reinterpreted the nature of the Christian faith as professed in America. This in itself would be an exciting problem for the church historian to pursue.

From this brief analysis of the images of religion constructed by non-clerical Europeans, it is obvious that through their special perspectives they noted most of the factors that church historians have since generalized as distinctively American. They achieved, to a remarkable degree, what recent church historians have called for. They developed insights and generalizations not based on the assumptions operative among European church historians. The reason is simple enough—though they reflected the habits and mores of European Christians, they did not carry the systematic and necessarily sophisticated theological assumptions of the church historians. This

provided the observers both with sufficient continuity to seek to understand Christianity in America and with enough freedom to recognize and appreciate utterly strange and unusual developments.

Is it possible that they introduced the sociological perspective into the discipline of church history in America? Or, did they only inadvertently reflect that perspective as they sought to make sense of the peculiar developments of Christianity in America? In either case, their importance as interpreters cannot be underestimated. We are all indebted to them for calling our attention to the distinctiveness of the following elements in Christianity in America—religious liberty, the centrality of morality and success of the church under the system of separation, the universality of activism and revivalism, and the predominance of an anti-intellectual, anti-historical spirit coupled with a faith in the perfectibility of man.

Several of these insights, particularly as developed by De Tocqueville, never have been worked out adequately. For example, his conception of equality provides us with a point of departure for a much more sophisticated and subtle analysis of the success and continuance of revivalism in American life. If this were combined with a penetrating theological interpretation it would be most welcome. Also, sufficient use of De Tocqueville's generalizations on equality in relation to the autonomy of reason has not been made by church historians. The different ways this was worked out in relation to religion in the West and in the East would be most instructive. The Europeans remind us that present generalizations concerning American faith in general, the faith in faith, the domestication of Christianity by Americanism, "other-directed" Christians and the utilitarian activism of our churches, must seek their explanation in additional factors beyond modern technocracy and urbanization. We have not yet exhausted the implications of these European images for our interpretation of Christianity in America.

The obvious weakness of these observers is their greatest strength. They saw these factors apart from the nature of the religious faith and the historic community that nurtured and nursed it. They did not probe the sources of the particular religious experience out of which the Americans came; hence, their observations must always be placed in a wider context by the church historian. If the task of the American church historian is to analyze and to interpret the life of the Christian community in the American scene, he will find the insights of these European observers exceedingly provocative and stimulating. Nevertheless, he will not find in them a framework sufficiently broad and deep to make sense of the Christian com-

munity in America in terms both of its continuities and its discontinuities with the church universal. It is at this point that the creative task of the American church historian confronts our generation.

1. A. De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. H. Reeve, (New York: J. E. H. G. Langley, 1841) I, 337.
2. F. J. Grund, *The Americans in Their Moral, Social, and Political Relations*, (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brawn, Green & Longman, 1837) I, 294.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 295.
4. De Tocqueville, *op. cit.*, II, 68.
5. *Ibid.*, I, 342.
6. J. Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*, (Chicago: C. H. Sergel & Co., 1892) II, 596. A. De Tocqueville, *op. cit.*, I, 332.
7. F. J. Grund, *op. cit.*, I, 297f.
8. De Tocqueville, *op. cit.*, 331.
9. F. J. Grund, *op. cit.*, 298.
10. De Tocqueville, *op. cit.*, 335.
11. F. J. Grund, *op. cit.*, 281.
12. *Ibid.* p. 307.
13. W. L. George, *Hail, Columbia!*, (London: Chapman & Hall, Ltd., 1923) p. 112.
14. H. Munsterberg, *The Americans*, trans. E. B. Halt, (New York: McClure, Phillip & Co., 1907) p. 500.
15. De Tocqueville, *op. cit.*, II, 6f.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 28.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
19. F. J. Grund, *op. cit.*, I, 11.
20. De Tocqueville, *op. cit.*, I, 335.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE *BENAI QEIAMA* AND *BENAT QEIAMA* IN THE ANCIENT SYRIAN CHURCH

ARTHUR VÖÖBUS, *Chicago Lutheran Seminary*

The Syriac term *qeiama*, "covenant,"¹ with its derivations *benai qeiama*, "the sons of the covenant," and *benat qeiama*, "the daughters of the covenant,"² not only marks the idiosyncrasy of primitive Syrian Christianity but it also mirrors a development which parallels the whole process of transformation in ancient Syrian Christianity. Originally the term *qeiama* designated the whole church comprised of ascetically oriented Christians.³ Standing face to face with this singular concept of church and the peculiar profile of primitive Syrian Christianity, we must be reminded that the first Christian impulses in the lands of the Euphrates and Tigris did not come from Hellenistic Christianity via Antioch but from Palestinian Jewish Christianity.⁴ Therefore the earliest traditions implanted here reveal the Palestinian Aramaean influence not only in the contacts which these Christian Jews had with the Palestinian Jewish Christians⁵ but also in the use of the ancient Palestinian Targum as the first biblical texts translated into Syriac⁶ and in the fundamentally ascetic orientation of the Christian Kerygma⁷ which echoes the Palestinian ascetic trends.⁸ These archaic conditions, which understood the *qeiama* as the whole congregation of celibates who alone were admitted to baptism and sacramental life, were tenacious and were able to last for generations. However Burkitt's contention that these lasted even to the first part of the fourth century,⁹ as accepted also by Harnack,¹⁰ Ficker,¹¹ Plooijs¹² and others, must be corrected, since it does not fit in with the church historical premises as reflected in the sources. The change which adopted the concept of church known in Hellenistic Christianity, and admitted those who were not able to become ascetics to baptism, sacramental life and full membership, must have taken place earlier, before the end of the third century.¹³

However, a vital force always finds ways to continue its existence. It was no different for the dynamic part of the most ancient Syrian Christianity which could never agree to equate itself with the new form and abandon convictions for which it was willing to sacrifice its life. Now the term *qeiama* was inherited by those Christians who had the task of carrying on the archaic traditions in the changed situation. Under these circumstances the ties with the past could be kept only in a concealed manner in a sort of theological sublimation.¹⁴

These problems connected with the earliest phases of the *qeiama* have been investigated elsewhere. The following pages want to ex-

tend this investigation to the developed form of the institution of the *qeïama* as it existed in the ancient Syrian church.

With regard to this question, two sources, in the main legislative in nature and therefore particularly precious, offer us needed guidance. Of first importance is the information preserved in the rules under the name of Rabbula, bishop of Edessa (411-435). One set of the ordinances was designed to regulate the clergy and the institution of those Christians who dedicated themselves to the ascetic ideal within the context of the church.¹⁵ This cycle of rules, which we meet in the manuscript tradition in several recensions, remains our primary source, permitting us most important insight into the nature of this institution and its place in the life of the congregations. Besides this source of information, invaluable help comes also from the Pseudo-Nicaean canons which tradition has connected with Mar-uta's name.¹⁶ These texts, at various points, speak of the ascetics in the church. In our search for the enlargement of the bulk of our information, this source is particularly welcome since it does not repeat what we already know via Rabbula's rules, but illuminates new aspects in the organization of this institution.

Each source is thus the deposit of valuable tradition offering us major new elements and co-ordinates as to the institution of the ascetics in the first part of the 5th century. Besides these primary witnesses we have to utilize all the available data which Syriac literature has preserved from falling into oblivion. These findings repay our research. To be sure, these sources often offer very sporadic references telling very little that is new, though they are not wholly barren of good fruit. But there are some which are more talkative. In any case, the combined strength of all these sources constitutes a contribution which we can appreciate. This putting together of the data, through reliable information from legislative sources, through the mists of tradition and the stray allusions in the Syriac literature, enables us to see at least a number of important features of the institution of the *qeïama*.

Regarding the way the life of the members of the *qeïama* was organized in the congregations, our sources offer for the most part but indirect and casual remarks. Yet, these are sufficient for us to realize that no uniform practice had been adopted by all the congregations.

First of all, the members of the *qeïama* were forbidden to live with the seculars, family members excepted.¹⁷ Otherwise, the way was left open for several alternates. The members of the *qeïama* could live with their families.¹⁸ Another rule asserts of the priests, "if possible, they shall dwell with one another and the same also with

regard to the *benai qeiama*.¹⁹ The wording indicates that the smaller number by far of the *benai qeiama* lived in specially designed dwellings. Further we are told more about the location of their dwelling places. A ruling in connection with the priests says that they must live in the church, the deacons, too, and "if possible, also the *benai qeiama*."²⁰ Another canon, in fact, presupposes such a situation and regulates this life so that the *benai qeiama* are not permitted to place food into the apse, eat in the church, keep anything profane there, and ascend the raised floor of the altar.²¹

With regard to the *benat qeiama*, greater stress is placed upon communal life. In Rabbula's rules it is commanded that, if possible, they should live together.²² We learn the same from other sources. This is told in a source²³ which conceals its author behind the name of Amphilochius.²⁴ There seems to be a hint in an expansion of the Greek text found in the Syriac recension of Eusebius' work on the Palestinian martyrs.²⁵ The canons of Maruta particularly offer provision for such groups. Here we learn that this "order of sisters" must have a master over them, a diligent one, who will instruct them in the scripture lessons and particularly in psalmody.²⁶

The *benai qeiama* and *benat qeiama* took the vow of virginity and became the "brides of Christ." All the measures of Rabbula manifest vigilance in protecting this virtue. It was forbidden for the *benai qeiama* to live with women, and for the *benat qeiama* to live with men.²⁷ Also other rigid disciplinary measures were designed to protect the ideal of virginity. Everyone who became weak and fell into temptation by wanting to marry faced the threat of being sent to the judges in the town.²⁸ After this, they were kept secluded in the monasteries and put into the penal system, to produce repentance.²⁹ About those who dared to approach a *bart qeiama* with these intentions, it is said: "they shall be anathematized, bound and sent to the judges in the town."³⁰

As to other ascetic practices the sources offer only very casual references. The legislative sources forbid the use of wine and meat,³¹ but beyond this there is no explicit rule which would better explain the emphasis on fasting which occurs frequently. The biographer of Rabbula repeats what we already know through the original canons. The only new bit of information is that the members of the *qeiama* were forbidden to wash themselves.³²

So far as we can judge, on the basis of a number of references, the *benai qeiama* and the *benat qeiama* did not take an express vow of poverty. This conclusion gains force from two rules. The first does not allow the priests to make collections from the members of the *qeiama*.³³ The second constitutes a warning against the members

of the *qeïama* not to take usury or even interest.³⁴ These speak a sufficiently clear language.

As to the outward insignia of the members of the *qeïama*, the sources are hardly more magnanimous. That a garment distinguished the members of the *qeïama*, is expressly said in the rules of Johanan bar Kursos.³⁵ But on this matter, there is nothing in the rules of Rabbula. However, his biographer knows that Rabbula's directives also included these matters. He assures us that the bishop of Edessa regulated the garment, shoes and the hairdressing of the *benai qeïama*.³⁶ The same author offers us more help regarding the *benai qeïama*: "and the whole *qeïama* of women he admonished always that the face of a bride of Christ shall not appear without the veil of chastity on the street before the eyes of men."³⁷

This leads us to the question of the maintenance of the members of the *qeïama*. Here we would be in complete darkness were it not for the rules of Rabbula.

Several injunctions impose the duty of maintenance upon the village priests³⁸ and the members of the congregations, as is the case of Rabbula's canons in a different recension.³⁹ Another rule offers provisions for the case of the village priest unable to secure their minimum needs: "but if this is not in his power [lit., hands] he shall inform us that we may be solicitous about them, so, that, because of their need they may not be compelled to do something that is not suitable."⁴⁰ An illustration of such a case appears in the biography of Rabbula. In connection with the preparations he made in the presentiments of his approaching death, it is said that Rabbula sent his deacons out earlier than was usual—to bring his gifts for the members of the *qeïama* outside in towns and villages and to the monks.⁴¹

The ending of the rule just quoted refers to other possibilities in securing maintenance. There were situations which compelled the members of the *qeïama* to take this question into their hands. This is also reflected in several subsidiary directives dealt with in the injunctions. They are concerned with unworthy positions not congruous with the honor of the *qeïama*, but do not say what is permitted. So it is stated regarding the priests, deacons and the *benai qeïama* that: "they shall not become watchmen of granaries and vineyards, or hirelings for the laymen."⁴² Another recension of the same rules says that the members of the *qeïama* not only could not become servants of the lay people but they were even forbidden to supervise some tasks.⁴³ Another rule forbids dealing with lawsuits⁴⁴ and business.⁴⁵ These injunctions partially register the way the members of the *qeïama* tried to resolve the problem of maintenance.

In the structure of the church, the institution of the *qeïama* was submitted to the surveillance of the clergy, more exactly to the authority of the priests and deacons. That the responsibility was placed in the hands of the priests is clear from the injunctions which regulate various questions of practical life. Thus, the *benai qeïama* were not permitted to go to the gatherings or to other places without the priests, nor the *benat qeïama* without the deaconesses.⁴⁶ The priests were also responsible that they did not go to the church at night.⁴⁷

The same role of the clergy can be seen from another angle, namely through measures taken against the misuse of this authority on the part of the clergy. Some of them were clearly designed to protect the members of the *qeïama* in their position of subordination. One prohibits any attempts to make collections from the members of the *qeïama*.⁴⁸ Another is meant as an aid for the *benat qeïama* by forbidding their exploitation for the purpose of weaving garments. The text says: "to compel them by force."⁴⁹ A third one protects the female members by prohibiting the clergy from using them as attendants.⁵⁰

More light is cast upon the nature of this supervision if we consult another source, namely the canons of Maruta. These inform us of the responsibility that rested with the chorepiscopus. Twice a year he had to gather the entire *qeïama* of the villages and read them the canons—a device in the interest of the discipline.⁵¹ Another canon prescribes that twice a year the chorepiscopus had to gather the entire *qeïama* of the villages "for the honor of the bishop."⁵² These gatherings were for the spiritual exercises. In connection with these, the Eucharist and the blessing are especially meant. The time is scheduled at the beginning of winter and after the feast of the resurrection.⁵³

Now it remains for us to deal with the last important facet in the phenomenon of the *benai qeïama* and the *benat qeïama*, namely their duties and activities. The sources agree by taking the same stand. There is no description given in the legislative sources. They simply presuppose what we want to know.

The observance of their own religious obligations stemming from the nature of the body of the *qeïama* is characterized only very generally as "prayer and fasting."⁵⁴ What this meant more exactly in the terms of regulated practice of religious duties, remains obscure. The ruling that the *benai qeïama* and the *benat qeïama* have to learn the psalms and the *benat qeïama* also the hymns in addition to the psalms⁵⁵ does not help us very much.

The ecclesiastical duties of the members of the *qeïama* appear in a somewhat better light. The *benai qeïama* and the *benat qeïama* ap-

pear together with the priests and deacons: "they shall be continual in the worship service of the church and shall not cease the times of prayer and psalmody night and day."⁵⁶ This rule is of broad scope thereby reducing its value for us. All we find regarding these duties in the legislative sources is decidedly less than satisfying. The fact, however, that the *qeïama* had these functions is expressly stated in the texts which we find in the acts of Marta: "I confess Thee, Jesus, the Lamb of God who takes the sin of the world, for Thine name were sacrificed the shepherd-bishops, pastors, and the helpers to the pastors [namely] the holy *qeïama*."⁵⁷ According to this text their functions are referred to as the assistants to the pastors, i.e. the helpers of the clergy for minor duties and assignments. It is certain that the *qeïama* had an integral part in the worship service. In Edessa the *qeïama* of women had a part in the liturgy, reciting the hymns composed by Ephrem,⁵⁸ which were performed at the festivals of the martyrs and at worship services.⁵⁹ What can be seen in the biography of Šem'ôn Estonaia is an illustration of this. The groups of the *qeïama* accompanied their priests who held their worship services at the column of this saint.⁶⁰ However, the local situation here must have been quite different in the extent of the employment of the *qeïama* in the worship services. A reasonable margin of elasticity must be allowed.

But the matter does not quite end here. Some other observations help to clarify this indistinct picture. Since the members of the *qeïama* were under the supervision of the clergy, the clergy certainly used them at their discretion in the service of the church. And, indeed, we encounter sources which bring us face to face with the fact that members of the *qeïama* were engaged in many-sided activities.

First, the *benai qeïama* were used in the area of church administration. One area is clearly delineated in the legislative sources. The injunction that a secular is not permitted to become a *rabbaita*, "manager," "steward" in the church (the exception being made only where there are no *benai qeïama*,) throws an interesting side-light on the variety of duties of the *qeïama*.⁶¹ This refers to the services of the attendants in the congregations.

It is also natural that needs for work outside the area of worship and administration led the clergy to use the members of the *qeïama*. The matter is taken a stage farther when we leave the legislative documents and go to other sources. Particularly the reports which the biographer of Rabbula has woven into his narrative repay close examination. Here we can see how the *benai qeïama* and *benat qeïama* constituted a reserve which furnished the area of charity with personnel. In connection with the foundation of a hospital, the au-

thor says a few words about the workers engaged here. Active believers and energetic deacons were appointed to direct the work, but for the actual service, Rabbula employed the *benai qeïama*.⁶² With regard to the hospital for women, the same situation is manifested. Rabbula appointed a deaconess as the head but, again, the actual work of nursing fell upon the *benat qeïama*.⁶³ The same situation once again is shown in connection with the work of charity with the lepers. The responsibility for leadership was entrusted to the hands of a deacon, but the men who carried the burden of this selfless service came from the ranks of the *benai qeïama*.⁶⁴

Further development continued in this direction and bound the *qeïama* closer to the duties of charity. In Pseudo-Amphilochius we read that the *benat qeïama* had as their occupation the care of the poor.⁶⁵

Finally, the members of the *qeïama* constituted a pool for the prospective clergy. The so-called canons of Maruta show to what extent this was the case. Describing the duties of the chorepiscopus in connection with filling vacant churches, this source offers precise directions as to how to act. He had to look over the *qeïama* and select candidates for ordination. Only in those villages where there were no *benai qeïama* was he instructed to take monks from the monasteries.⁶⁶ The same source directs the selection of the deaconesses. These were selected from the *benat qeïama*, those, namely, who since their youth had been blameless, particularly when they had reached, in penitence, the age⁶⁷ of 60 years.

As we have seen, long before the end of the fourth century the term *qeïama* was inherited by the group of Christians upon whom fell the task of carrying on the tradition of ascetic Christianity in the heart of the congregations. In such a changed situation, it was proper to call this *qeïama* "the *qeïama* of the church."⁶⁸ Regardless of its situation, changed to a certain extent, it still was the backbone of the church. Certainly it was so in the eyes of the members of the *qeïama*, and also in the eyes of all to whom asceticism was the only form of existence for those of the Christian faith. Irrespective of the view of asceticism, moreover, all had to admit the centrality of the *qeïama* on the basis of the actual functions of the institution. In this respect a significant attestation is made about the members of the *qeïama* in an explanatory remark on the importance of the *qeïama*: "the churches and monasteries will be constituted (or will have their existence) through them."⁶⁹

Thus, owing to the united strength of our sources, the institution of the *qeïama* emerges from the half-light which envelops it,

and gives us some insight into its role in the life of the ancient Syrian congregations.

1. This does not mean simply a "state" or "stand" as suggested by A. J. Wensinck, "Qejama und Benai Qejama," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* LXIII (Halle, 1909), 561. The central thought is the covenant idea, including the idea of oath and vow. A secondary meaning of the term is the group of persons who keep the vow or covenant.
2. We may translate these formations simply as the "Covenanters."
3. F. C. Burkitt, *Early Christianity Outside the Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1902), 50ff.; *Early Eastern Christianity* (London, 1904), 127.
4. A. Vööbus, *History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*, in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, Subsidia III (Louvain, 1951), 17ff.
5. *Ibid.*, 18f.
6. A. Vööbus, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs. Neues Licht zur Frage der Herkunft der Peschitta aus dem altpalästinischen Targum*, in *Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile* IX (Stockholm, 1958), 105ff.
7. A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient: A Contribution to the History of Culture in the Near East*, vol. I, in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, Subsidia XIV (Louvain, 1958), 10ff.
8. A. Vööbus, "The Significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the History of Early Christianity," in *Yearbook of the Estonian Learned Society in America* II (New York, 1958).
9. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, 127ff; "Syriac-speaking Christianity," in *The Cambridge Ancient History* XII (Cambridge, 1939), 499.
10. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* II (Leipzig, 1906), 123. Cf. 19242 II, 691f.
11. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* XXXI (Leipzig, 1907), 432f.
12. "Eine enkratistische Glosse im Diatessaron," in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* XXII (Giessen, 1923), 8.
13. A. Vööbus, *Celibacy, a Requirement for Admission to Baptism in the Early Syrian Church*, in *Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile* I (Stockholm, 1951), 35ff.; 45ff.
14. An interesting insight into the transformation from this aspect is given by the *Kitaba de-masqata*, "Liber graduum," ed. M. Kmosko, in *Patrologia syriaca* I, 3 (Paris, 1926); see A. Vööbus, "Liber graduum: Some Aspects of Its Significance for the History of Early Syrian Asceticism," in *Charisteria Johanni Köpp octogenario oblata* (Holmiae, 1954), 108ff.
15. *S. Ephraemi Syri Rabulae episcopi Edesseni Balaei aliorumque opera selecta*, ed. J. J. Overbeck (Oxonii, 1865), 215ff.
16. Ms. Mus. Borg. syr. 82, fol. 38a—50a.
17. Can. X, *Opera selecta*, ed. Overbeck 216.
18. Can. II: with his mother, sister or daughter; can. X: with relatives, *ibid.*, 215f.
19. Can. XVIII, *ibid.*, 217.
20. Can. XLII, *ibid.*, 220.
21. Can. XLVIII, *ibid.*, 220.
22. Can. XVIII, *ibid.*, 217.
23. Pseudo-Amphilochius, Turgama, in *Acta martyrum et sanctorum*, ed. P. Bedjan (Paris, 1896), VI, 311.
24. A. Vööbus, "Das literarische Verhältnis zwischen der Biographie des Rabbula und dem Pseudo-Amphilochianischen Panegyrikus über Basilus," in *Oriens Christianus* XLIV (Wiesbaden, 1960), 40ff.
25. *History of Martyrs in Palestine by Eusebius*, ed. W. Cureton (London, 1861), 19.
26. Ms. Mus. Borg. syr. 82, fol. 41a.
27. Can. II, *Opera selecta*, ed. Overbeck 215.
28. Can. XXVIII, *ibid.*, 218.
29. Can. XXIX, *ibid.*
30. Can. XXVIII, *ibid.*
31. Can. XXIII, *ibid.*, 217f.
32. "That they shall not eat meat nor wash themselves while they are sound, he commanded to them," *Vita Rabbulae*, in *Opera selecta*, ed. Overbeck 176.
33. Can. VI, *ibid.*, 215f.
34. Can. IX, *ibid.*, 216.
35. *Canones Johannis Bar Cursus Tellae Mauzelatae episcopi*, ed. C. Kuberczyk (Lipsiae, 1901), can. X.
36. *Vita Rabbulae*, ed. Overbeck 177.
37. *Ibid.*, 177.
38. Can. XII, *Opera selecta*, ed. Overbeck 216.
39. Can. XI in Ms. Par. syr. 62, fol. 227b; Ms. Ming. syr. 8, fol. 149b.
40. Can. XIX, *Opera selecta*, ed. Overbeck 217.

INSTITUTION OF THE BENAI QEIAMA AND BENAT QEIAMA 27

41. *Vita Rabbulae*, ed. Overbeck 206; cf. A. Vööbus, *La vie d'Alexandre en grec—un temoign d'une biographie de Rabboula écrite en syriaque* (Pinnerberg, 1948), 15f.
42. Can. XXV, *Opera selecta*, ed. Overbeck 218.
43. Can. X in Ms. Par. syr. 62, fol. 227a; Ms. Ming. syr. 8, fol. 149b.
44. Can. XXVI, *Opera selecta*, ed. Overbeck 218.
45. Can. IX, *ibid.*, 216.
46. Can. XXXVII, *ibid.*, 219.
47. Can. XVIII, *ibid.*, 217.
48. Can. VI, *ibid.*, 215f.
49. "The priests and deacons and the *benai qeiama* shall not compel the *benat qeiama* to weave garments for them by force," can. III, *ibid.*, 215.
50. Can. III, *ibid.*, 215.
51. Ms. Mus. Borg. syr. 82, fol. 46a.
52. Ms. Mus. Borg. syr. 82, fol. 45a.
53. Ms. Mus. Borg. syr. 82, fol. 45a.
54. "That they shall be occupied with fasting and persevere in prayer," *Vita Rabbulae*, ed. Overbeck 177.
55. Can. XX, *Opera selecta*, ed. Overbeck 217.
56. Can. XXVII, *ibid.*, 218.
57. *Acta martyrum et sanctorum*, ed. P. Bedjan (Paris, 1891), II, 238.
58. *Acta Ephraemi XXXII*, in *Ephraem Syri opera omnia syriace*, ed. S. E. Assemani (Romae, 1743) III, LII; *Historia Ephraemi*, in *Hymni et sermones*, ed. T. J. Lamy (Mechliniae, 1890), II, 67.
59. A. Vööbus *Literary Critical and Historical Studies in Ephrem the Syrian*, in *Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile X* (Stockholm, 1958), 124ff.
60. *Acta martyrum et sanctorum*, ed. P. Bedjan (Paris, 1894) IV, 534f.
61. Can. XLV, *Opera selecta*, ed. Overbeck 220.
62. *Vita Rabbulae*, ed. Overbeck 203.
63. *Ibid.*, 203.
64. *Ibid.*, 203f.
65. *Turgama*, ed. Bedjan 311, 317. About the development see Vööbus, *Das literarische Verhältnis etc.*
66. "And are there villages where there are no *benai qeiama* of whom he [i.e., the chorepiscopus] shall make priests, (in this case) he shall bring out brothers from the monasteries or churches which are under his authority, and shall make them," Ms. Mus. Borg. syr. 82, fol. 44b.
67. Ms. Mus. Borg. syr. 82, fol. 41a.
68. Ms. Par. syr. 62, fol. 227a.; Ms. Ming. syr. 8, fol. 149a.
69. Ms. Mus. Borg. 82, fol. 45a.

FREDERICK II AND THE CHURCH IN THE KINGDOM OF SICILY 1220-1224

JAMES M. POWELL, *Kent State University*

The policy of Frederick II toward the Church in the kingdom of Sicily during the period 1220 to 1224 follows logically from that of his Norman predecessors. Its aim was the restoration of the ecclesiastical privileges which had been held by the Norman kings to the death of William II (1189) and the recovery of dues, rents, services and prerogatives usurped from the crown by the ecclesiastical magnates of the kingdom during the "Time of Troubles" (1189-1209). Practical considerations were of fundamental importance in the formation of this policy. Within the kingdom, the Church was a potential rival to the establishment of a strong monarchy. The Norman kings of Sicily, like the Norman kings of England, had exercised considerable control over the appointment of bishops and, in Sicily and Calabria, over the holding of church councils and the attendance of the bishops at them. Though generous in their grants to the Church, the Norman kings of Sicily both expected and obtained the cooperation of churchmen in imposing strong rule over the kingdom. In desiring to restore the Norman pattern of relations between the church and kingdom, Frederick was faced with the fact that important changes had taken place since the death of William II. Not only had the personnel of the Church changed, but the authority of the papacy within the kingdom had been greatly increased while Innocent III acted as regent during Frederick's minority (1198-1209).

The close association between Frederick and the Papacy during his early career is in marked contrast to their increasing difficulties after 1230. Beyond doubt, the dividing line between the two periods is the coronation of Frederick as Holy Roman Emperor in November, 1220. Frederick, as heir of the Hohenstaufen claims to the imperial dignity and as protégé of Innocent III, was thrust onto the German scene to counterbalance the ambitions of Otto IV. Innocent and the Curia took a calculated risk in pushing Frederick's candidacy in that they endangered the long-held papal policy of preventing union between Germany and Italy. Though Frederick had resigned his southern kingdom in favor of his infant son before embarking for Germany, the death of Innocent III and the accession of the more pliable Honorius III, combined with the success of his quest for the German crown, made him reopen negotiations for a union of the Empire and the *Regno* at least during his own lifetime. The weak

opposition of Honorius enabled him to achieve the union. But the suspicions of the Roman Curia had been aroused. It was Frederick's task to allay these suspicions. The concessions made by him to the ecclesiastical princes in Germany (1220) served this purpose in the Empire. But the task in the *Regno* was more difficult. There the bishops and abbots had joined with the lay nobility in taking advantage of the weakness of the monarchy during the "Time of Troubles." The problem facing Frederick was how to recover the position lost by the crown without alienating the Church.

The promulgation of a series of new laws at Capua by Frederick in December, 1220, had marked the beginning of his attempt to restore the fabric of Norman government. He called on all his subjects "to observe firmly all the good usages and customs by which they were accustomed to live in the time of King William."¹ He showed himself especially solicitous to recover domains, taxes, rents, and royal rights alienated from the crown during the "Time of Troubles," and to suppress illegal markets and tolls, which had been established by nobles and ecclesiastics since the death of William II in 1189.²

Only one of the laws issued at Capua pertained directly to the Church. Frederick ordered that tithes should be paid to the Church as in the time of King William, and he took its property and rights under the royal protection.³ Writing in March, 1221, to Pope Honorius III, Frederick reiterated this position with regard to the Church, assuring the Pope that he would not violate the rights of churches and ecclesiastics.⁴ There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of his assurance. Indeed, at this time, Frederick had every reason to promote close relations between himself and the Church. Faced with rebellion by some of the barons in the kingdom, he did not enjoy a sufficiently strong position to reject the friendship of the papacy, which had, in the years just preceding, maintained him king in southern Italy and Sicily and brought him the crown of the Holy Roman Empire.

The legislation issued at Capua was intended to restore the traditional framework of government rather than to initiate new administrative practice. While it is true that Frederick sought to increase royal authority, he nevertheless recognized the limitations placed upon him by custom. The word *custom* either as a noun or verb (*consuetudo* or *consueo*) appears in more than one fourth of the twenty laws and, in all cases, constitutes an endorsement of the procedures followed during the reign of the last Norman king. Even where some historians have seen innovation, a close examination fails to reveal any radical departure from earlier methods. The frequently cited prohibition against the holding of the justiciarship by ec-

clesiastics was designed not so much to prevent them from holding office as to subject all holders to the direct authority of the king; in other words, to prevent the growth of a traditional class or group of office holders. This becomes obvious when we examine the full prohibition: "No ecclesiastical or secular person may act as justiciar save those to whom the office has been entrusted by us."⁵ A careful reading of the laws issued at Capua forces the conclusion that Frederick's policy was not anti-ecclesiastical, and that his assurance to Honorius III in the letter of March, 1221, that he would not violate the rights and property of ecclesiastics was not an attempt to deceive.

The statements within the laws, however, are not in themselves conclusive evidence of the actual practice that Frederick and his officials followed in their enforcement. At best, the laws expressed only the intention of the legislator. It is necessary to study the methods whereby the laws of Capua were enforced and the manner of enforcement in order to determine whether the actual policy followed by Frederick during the years 1220-1224 was anti-ecclesiastical.

The charters issued to ecclesiastics by Frederick in the months following the issuance of the laws of Capua reveal that he attempted to achieve the aims of the laws without alienating the Church. There was nothing new in the means employed; there was innovation in the manner in which Frederick applied them. The key to his methods is to be found in the law *De resignandis privilegiis* which ordered all holders of privileges to resign them to the crown. The terminal dates assigned were Easter, 1221, for those dwelling on the mainland, and Pentecost, 1221, for those dwelling on the island of Sicily. All privileges granted after the death of William II, including even those granted by Frederick himself, were affected.⁶ The precedents for this law were fairly numerous; Frederick, however, did not have to go any farther back than 1197, when his father, Henry VI, had attempted to carry out a resignation of privileges as part of his reorganization of the kingdom following its conquest.⁷

While it is impossible to speak of the degree of compliance to this law in terms of absolute percentages, the number of charters confirmed under its terms in the period after February, 1221, provides plentiful evidence that few of the ecclesiastical proprietors attempted to evade the law.⁸ No doubt, some hastened to take advantage of Frederick's promise that his grants and privileges would be valid *in perpetuum*, but most came out of fear of the imperial indignation.⁹ In most cases privileges which were presented contained the formula "after the court celebrated at Capua" or, more briefly still, "*post curiam Capuae*."¹⁰ The dispatch with which so many privileges were confirmed in a relatively short period goes a long way to answering

any charges that Frederick used the Law of Privileges in a wholesale manner against the rights and properties of the Church in his kingdom.

Although only a single exemption from the law has come down to us—that granted to the monastery of Sanctus Ioannis de Flore in June, 1221—this fact, when coupled with the evidence still to be presented, does not make a case for strong enforcement.¹¹ Much more indicative of the general policy followed by the royal officials are the clauses of reservation inserted in some of the privileges confirmed by Frederick. These clauses permit a detailed study of the somewhat uneasy relationships between the Emperor and certain ecclesiastics who enjoyed privileges, to be sure, but privileges which the Emperor wished to be able to override subsequently without incurring the charge of violating his own grants. The most commonly found form of reservation, and one which will be treated here in detail, is expressed in the formula: "*salvo mandato et ordinatione nostra.*"

The historical origins of the clause are traceable to the formula used by the papal chancery: "*salva sedis apostolice auctoritate.*"¹² The precedent followed by Frederick, however, was much more proximate. Henry VI had inserted the same and similar clauses into his privileges.¹³

The meaning of the clause has been discussed frequently.¹⁴ Perhaps the most complete summary of its significance was attempted by Huillard-Bréholles, when he stated that it "subordinated the duration of the grant to a new examination of the pretensions of the holder. . . ."¹⁵ By inserting this clause in charters whose validity he questioned, Frederick avoided the necessity of dealing immediately with the violators of royal rights as a group and left the way open for individual negotiations. The case of the monastery, Sancta Maria de Monte Virginis, illustrates how negotiations might stretch over a relatively long period and how the final results might not always be favorable to the crown.

In July, 1221, Frederick confirmed a charter for the abbot of the monastery in which he reserved the custody of the castle of Rocella, "according to the custom of the time of King William," but ordered the clause, "*salvo mandato et ordinatione nostra,*" which had apparently been contained in an earlier confirmation, to be removed.¹⁶ However, when William, judge of Avellino, drew up a duplicate of the privilege of July, 1221, needed by the monastery in the course of its business, he inserted the *salvo mandato* clause.¹⁷ In July, 1222, the abbot appeared at the royal court and sought the removal of the clause. Frederick acceded to the request of the abbot, noting that

the clause was prejudicial to the liberties of the monastery.¹⁸ Although the paucity of documentation prevents a full analysis of the evidence, it seems clear that the recovery of the castle of Rocella was the point at issue here. The mistake, whereby Judge William of Avellino failed to omit the offending clause, brings out the attitude of the holders of privileges toward its inclusion in the confirmations of their charters.

In December, 1222, and again in February, 1223, Frederick issued privileges to the monastery. He made it clear that no one was to dare disturb the properties of the monastery by reason of the constitution, *De resignandis privilegiis*, and he confirmed various grants to the monastery without the inclusion of the *salvo mandato* clause.¹⁹ Finally, one year later, Frederick granted a charter to the monastery which not only guaranteed its rights against any attempt on them, but confirmed the possessions of the monastery *in perpetuo* without any burden of service, including the custody of the castle of Rocella.²⁰ From this charter it would seem that Frederick regranted to the monastery the very thing which he had obtained from it. His use of the *salvo mandato* clause to enforce the Law of Privileges against the monastery seems to have failed.

This conclusion receives some confirmation from the charters granted to other monasteries after April, 1222, and from a letter sent to officials of the kingdom after that date. On April 23, Frederick wrote to the justiciars and other officials ordering them to cease molesting the rights of ecclesiastical persons and to observe the immunities which they had possessed in the time of William II.²¹ It was largely after that date that the royal chancery showed itself more willing to issue charters in which, as "a special favor," the offending clause of reservation was not included.²² The indication is very strong that Frederick was forced to abandon much of his policy of restoring the fabric of Norman government as it touched the ecclesiastics of the kingdom.

Miss H. J. Pybus, writing on Frederick's relations with the Church in Sicily, noted that the Emperor was far from being an inveterate enemy of churchmen and church privileges.²³ She concluded, however, that Frederick's determination to recover the possessions which had belonged to the crown before the death of William II brought more suffering to the Church than to the lay nobility.²⁴ Indeed, this would have been the case had the Emperor followed consistently the policy which he had introduced immediately after his promulgation of the Laws of Capua, and which is implicit in the *salvo mandato* clause. But after the early months of 1222, the royal chancery dealt more leniently with the Church, and for fairly ob-

vious reasons. Beyond doubt, Frederick had intended to apply the Law of Privileges with equal vigor against both ecclesiastical and lay holders of privileges. He was prevented from carrying out this policy chiefly because he needed the support of the Church, not merely the papacy, but perhaps even more the active assistance of the bishops and abbots within the kingdom. That he was successful in winning local ecclesiastical support is proved by the way in which the churchmen supported him when Gregory IX invaded the Kingdom in 1229. From 1222 to 1239, Frederick was, as Miss Pybus maintained, on good terms with most of the bishops and was also quite generous in distributing privileges among them.²⁵ However, this cordial relationship existed only after the failure of an initially strict policy implied in the use of the clause *salvo mandato et ordinatione nostra* during the two years immediately after 1220, when Frederick promulgated the Laws of Capua. Between 1220 and 1223, Frederick desired above all to restore the relations between the monarchy and the ecclesiastical holders of privileges as they had been prior to the death of William II.

Frederick II based his attitude toward the Church in Sicily on practical considerations. In doing so, it does not seem that he was motivated by an anti-ecclesiastical or anti-religious bias. It is significant that most of the evidence tending to show an anti-religious bias comes from the period of active controversy with the papacy (1239-1250), during the pontificates of Gregory IX and Innocent IV. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that Frederick did not permit himself to be swayed by religious sentiments; he became more lenient with the ecclesiastical holders of privilege only after he had tested a firmer policy. To the extent, therefore, that Frederick was a political realist, the "modernity" of his ecclesiastical policy is obvious; to the extent that he followed precedents established in the Norman period, his attitude illustrates the presence of "modern" political concepts at work within the framework of a feudal monarchy.

1. Riccardus de Sancto Germano, *Chronica, Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, new edition (Città di Castello: Istituto Storico Italiano, 1900-), VII: 2, 88. "Inprimis precipimus omnibus fidelibus, videlicet prelati ecclesiarum, comitibus, baronibus civibusque, terris et omnibus de regno nostro omnes bonos usus et consuetudines, quibus consueverunt vivere tempore regis Guillelmi, firmiter observari."

2. *Ibid.*, p. 90. Laws VIII, VIII (sic), X.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 89. "Item precipimus ecclesiis decimas dari iuxta consuetudinem regis Guillelmi, et ut nullus justitias ec-

clesiarum detineat et bona eorum invadat."

4. J. L. A. Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia Diplomatica Friderici Secundi*. 6 vols. with a Preface and Introduction. (Paris: H. Plon, 1852-61), II, 139-40. (Hereafter cited as *H.-B.*)

5. Riccardus de Sancto Germano, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 91. "Volumus et districte iubemus ut quia post obitum domini imperatoris Henrici sigillum nostrum devenit ad manus Mareualdi; qui de ipso sigillo plura confecisse dicitur que sunt in praeiudicium nostrum, et

- simile factum patatur de sigillo imperatricis matris nostre post obitum eius, universa privilegia, que facta sunt et concessa ab eisdem imperatore et imperatrice ab hiis qui sunt citra Farum usque ad Pascha resurrectionis Domini presentetur: et ab illis de Sicilia usque ad Pentecostem. Omnia etiam privilegia et concessionum scripta a nobis cuilibet hactenus facta in eisdem terminis precipimus presentari. Quod si non presentauerint, ipsis privilegiis non impune utantur; set irritatis penitus qui ea conculcaverint, indignationem imperialem incurrant."
7. Paul Scheffer-Boichorst, "Das Gesetz Kaiser Friedrich's II. 'De resignandis privilegiis'," *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, I (1900), 133.
 8. Most of these charters have been collected in two sets: Eduard Winkelmann, *Acta Imperii inedita seculi XIII.* 2 vols. (Innsbruck: Wagner'schen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1880-5), I; *H.-B.*, II.
 9. Riccardus de Sancto Germano, *op. cit.*, p. 92. Law XVI.
 10. See, for example, the privilege of October, 1222 to the Cistercian monastery of Sancta Maria de Ferraria. *H.-B.*, II, 267.
 11. *Ibid.*, II, 194.
 12. Cf. the discussion on this point in Hans Niese, *Die Gesetzgebung der normannischen Dynastie im Regnum Siciliae* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1910), p. 159.
 13. Scheffer-Boichorst (*op. cit.*, p. 159) pointed to the form, *salvo mandato et ordinatione nostra et heredum nostro-*rum, as the more common usage by Henry VI. But Dione Clementi ("Calendar of the Diplomas of the Hohenstaufen Emperor Henry VI concerning the Kingdom of Sicily," *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, XXXV, 1955, 192) cites a grant of Henry to the monastery of St. John of Lecce dated February, 1197, containing the formula: *salvo mandato et ordinatione nostra*.
 14. See especially the work of Scheffer-Boichorst (*ibid.*), of Hans Niese (*op. cit.*) and, for a summary, that of Willy Cohn, *Das Zeitalter der Hohenstaufen in Sizilien* (Breslau: M. and H. Marcus, 1925), p. 83.
 15. *H.-B.*, Preface et Introduction, xvii.
 16. *Ibid.*, II, 197. "Preterea licet in quibuslibet privilegiis nostris illam clausulam jubeamus apponi que dicitur: salvo mandato et ordinatione nostra, ab hujusmodi tamen privilegio de solita benignitatis nostre gratia quam pluribus jam monasteriis fecimus super clausula illa, eam omnino precipimus amovendam."
 17. *Ibid.*, II, 204. October, 1221.
 18. *Ibid.*, II, 261. "... eximit ab illa clausula libertati ejus praejudicanti qua dicitur salvo mandato et ordinatione nostra."
 19. *Ibid.*, II, 280-1. December 18, 1222. The second privilege (*ibid.*, II, 304) is merely dated February, 1223.
 20. *Ibid.*, II, 405-9.
 21. *Ibid.*, II, 239. Letter of April 23, 1222.
 22. For example, to the Abbot of Casamare in June, 1222 (*ibid.*, II, 259-60); to Abbot Nicholas of Sancta Maria de Ferraria in October, 1222 (*ibid.*, II, 267); and to Anthony, Abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Roccadia (*ibid.*, II, 454-8).
 23. H. J. Pybus, "The Emperor Frederick II and the Sicilian Church," *Cambridge Historical Journal*, III (1929), 134. For the view that Frederick was motivated by anti-religious sentiments, see the discussion in Gennaro M. Monti, *Lo Stato normanno-svevo* (Trani: Vecchi, 1945), pp. 62-3.
 24. Pybus, *op. cit.*, p. 137.
 25. *Ibid.*, p. 163.

THE PROBLEM OF PAPAL PRIMACY AT THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE*

MARTIN ANTON SCHMIDT, *San Francisco Theological Seminary*

At Ferrara and Florence the healing of the old schism between the Eastern and Western Churches proved to be more than a hope, and in corresponding measure the breach between the Pope and the Council of Basel became less than a real new Occidental Schism. The Florence-Ferrara conception of Christian unity has led to the doctrine of the Vatican Council and will be of great importance at the council which has been announced by the present Pope. Together with our Roman Catholic brethren we are convinced that a clear understanding of the character of Christian unity must exist prior to all attempts at union or reunion of churches, prior as a condition and as an incentive to those efforts.

We are dealing with a serious theological problem, and we cannot fail to recognize that at Ferrara and Florence serious theological work was done. Here any discussion of the old question about the legitimacy of the union must take its start, rather than in evaluating such contributing factors as political needs, personal interests or even pressures. A man like Georgios Scholarios, who later denied the validity of the union, to which he had subscribed himself, maintained that the principal fault lay in the insufficient theological preparation, in which criticism he then had to include his own substantial contributions to the Florentine agreement on the procession of the Holy Spirit.¹ That a "union suitable and based upon the truth" could have come to pass under better circumstances he never denied.² It is another question whether or not Scholarios was only trying to rationalize a change in his attitude toward the work of Florence; also whether or not in his case non-theological reasons, which played such a great part in the final practical result, were decisive.³ But do such considerations entitle us to assume that Florence cherished only an illusion? Or did something become visible there which was at least a beginning of a new encounter in truth? If the latter is the case, then, of course, the last page in the history of this council and of its importance for the Christian world has not yet been written.

If the Council had had to deal only with the problem of the procession of the Holy Spirit, our answer would be easier. But there was, among other causes of division and issues of debate, the problem of papal supremacy or primacy.

*A paper read before the American Society of Church History on December 29, 1959, in Chicago.

There was no agreement of opinion, either in the Eastern or in the Western Church, about the degree to which this problem was decisive for a union.⁴ But usually it was regarded as an issue of debate second only to the problem of the *filioque*. Its discussion belongs to that part of the council which immediately preceded the decree of union. There were feelings among the Greeks that, after agreement had been reached about the understanding of the *filioque*, all other debates could be bypassed as not essential for the union. But when the Latins insisted on discussing and formulating some other points, and various attempts were made from the Greek side to reduce their number, it was the problem of papal primacy alone which was never singled out for a possible tacit or informal agreement or called a difference of minor importance.⁵ However, the fact that it was treated in a way quite different from the vehement and extended dialogue about the procession of the Holy Spirit was not solely due to the understandable anxiousness of the Greeks to come to an end and to return home. There *was* a debate concurrent in which the problem of papal primacy became more acute than all other concerns. It was the debate between Basel and Florence, not that between the Greeks and the Latins at Florence.

Although this problem was the only one in which the Pope had to meet a simultaneous and at least similar opposition from the conciliarists of Basel and from the Greeks, one cannot say that the Greek defenders of patriarchal rights exploited this situation or tried to add strength to their cause by adopting tenets of Western conciliarism.⁶ The very fact that they acknowledged as the Western representation Ferrara and Florence, and not Basel, was not only due to various historical factors (the question of the place of the Council, the split of the Fathers of Basel, the various embassies, financial and military considerations, etc.), but also to some theological concerns, in which the traditional Greek view appeared unable to envisage a representation of the Church apart from the Pope.

The issue between the followers of Eugene IV and the thoroughgoing conciliarists of Basel was about the relation between the Church and the Pope as the Church's earthly head. Whereas conciliarism saw this head as a member of the body of the Church and therefore subordinated his claims to those of the whole body, the other side viewed the Pope's headship in the light of divine origin and authorization, not in the light of privileges within a corporation. The addition of the corporative understanding of the Church to its old hierarchical understanding was a more recent Western development, alien to the way in which the Greeks understood their patriarchs and bishops as "heads" in the Church.⁷ The Ecumenical Council which, according to Greek views, was entitled to depose every patriarch in the

case of heresy, had this power as the representative of Christ or of the unity of the orthodox faith, not as a representative of a body of the Church. And no Western defender of papal privileges, however extreme, has denied that a heretical Pope could be deposed by a council or could be declared by it to have already ceased being the head of the Church. The deciding question was not what a synod could do under certain circumstances, but by what kind of authorization it could do so.

The fact that the Greeks chose the patriarch of the West and his synod over against the Western Church as represented by the remonstrating body at Basel is consistent with their view in which the order of representation goes from unity to multiplicity, to which a head of the Church is much more than a "single person," a single member of the body. What did they expect to take place? "A Universal Council according to the order and custom of the holy seven Universal Councils, and that the Holy Spirit may grant the establishment and maintenance of such council for the sake of peace."⁸ And over and over again it was said that the personal presence of the two highest patriarchs, representing West and East, was almost necessary, if the planned synod were really to become such a council of union.⁹ With the separation from the patriarch of the West, the successor of Peter, Basel lost its appeal. In men like Cesarini and Cusanus, the motif of unity and union overrode strong conciliaristic convictions; the symbolic power of the person of the Pope was stronger than critical questions about his privileges.¹⁰ Why should the Greeks resist? To the Latins, even to most of the conciliarists,¹¹ the Pope was more than the first of the patriarchs; but he was also the patriarch of the West, whatever else he might be.

Thus by their very views of Christian unity the Greeks were prompted to join the Pope without being papalists at all. When the issue of papal primacy came to the fore at Florence, was it not a worthwhile task for the papal theologians to show that the Greek position was less than an opposite view, but rather an incomplete one, incomplete but perfectible by sound theological reasoning?

However, the point of departure for any discussion of this problem was very similar to that point to which the whole debate about the *filioque* could be reduced. There the question was: Did "procession of the Holy Spirit through the Son" imply "merely through," or was it a "through" which could also mean "from"? And with respect to the papal primacy, the question was put: Was it merely a primacy of respect, a dignity of symbolical character? Or was it all this in such a way that it was at the same time more? In no other

issue of debate was such a sharp alternative, such a clear need for definition involved.¹²

After the settlement of the dogmatic question about the *filioque*, there was some discussion on which of the remaining points needed an official settlement with or without formal debate.¹³ On June 16, 1439, John of Montenero, the Lombard provincial of the Dominicans, delivered, in a public session, a discourse on the papal primacy, following almost word by word a *cedula*, i.e. a proposed wording of the part of the union decree referring to that subject, drafted earlier by the Latins.¹⁴ After him John of Torquemada, a Dominican too, did the same thing with respect to the questions on the Eucharist.¹⁵ In order to discuss these subjects, the following day some Latin theologians met with the synod of the Greeks, and the objections raised by the Greeks against some formulations of the *cedulae* were answered the next day (June 18), at another public session, by the same orators.¹⁶ To the presentation of both subjects some discussion was added.

During these and the following days, the Pope always insisted on the necessity of a formal agreement; for this purpose the *cedulae* had been proposed. Our impression of the various reactions of the Greeks, particularly of the Emperor, is that they would have preferred to base the whole union upon the agreement on the procession of the Holy Spirit, even when, with respect to the other issues, they were aware of differences between their views and those expressed in the *cedulae*. Toilsome deliberations and negotiations followed. Only on June 27 was an agreement on the essentials reached. It was now known which of the original *cedulae* should come into the decree of union, what should be omitted, and what added.¹⁷ But the formal difficulties in establishing the Latin and Greek texts of the decree were not straightened out before July 4.¹⁸ Two days later, Eugene IV promulgated it in the bull *Laetentur caeli*.¹⁹

To all the difficulties which had preceded and delayed this final event, the problem of the papal primacy had contributed its good share. Here the whole discussion had turned around the relation between the privileges of the Pope and those of the Eastern patriarchs and of the Emperor.²⁰ And when we compare the final wording of the decree with the original proposal of the Latins,²¹ it seems that the Greeks were successful, at least in part, at the end. The Pope's authority to convene the Church (i.e., in its Ecumenical Councils) was no longer mentioned, while, on the other hand, a clause and a paragraph had been added: "as it [*scil.*, the preceding definition of the powers of the Pope] is also contained in the acts of the Ecumenical Councils and in the sacred canons. Furthermore, we proclaim anew the order of the other venerable patriarchs, as it is handed down in

the canons, namely, that the Patriarch of Constantinople is second after the most holy Roman Pontiff, and third the Alexandrine, fourth the Antiochian, fifth the Jerusalemite, under reservation of all their privileges and rights."²²

However, the importance of these changes cannot obscure the fact that the meaning of the whole statement on the papal primacy depends on those of its parts which had been proposed by the Latins and accepted by the Greeks without too much discussion. Their growing fixation on the problem of the patriarchal and imperial privileges hindered the Greeks from seeing that the issue was not decided by subtraction or addition of words but by the interpretation of the whole. The Latins built and explained their formulations in such a way that they became much more than expressions of some papal interests and concerns. In carefully chosen terms they expressed their ecclesiology. Their statement was much shorter than its predecessor of the Union Council of Lyons (1274), the Profession of Faith of Michael VIII.²³ All amplifications on the jurisdictional privileges of the Pope, which we find in that former document, now were omitted, and only the reason for and extent of these privileges were asserted again in similar terms: "primacy in the whole world" (*in universum orbem primatum*), "full power" (*plenam potestatem*).²⁴ But the full meaning of these words was to be grasped from their conjunction with a series of other words, honorary titles of the Pope, which we do not find in the profession of Lyons, but which in that of Florence add much specific meaning to the claims of primacy and full power as they derive thence their specific interpretation. They are: "true vicar of Christ, and head of the whole Church, and father and teacher of all Christians" (*verum Christi vicarium totiusque ecclesiae caput et omnium christianorum patrem et doctorem*). To these dignities the following powers are ascribed: "to lead to pasture, to rule, and to govern [in the first draft also: to convene] the Church Universal." These together are the "full power handed down to him [*scil.*, the Pope] in blessed Peter by our Lord Jesus Christ" (*Et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, [convocandi,] regendi, ac gubernandia universalem ecclesiam a domino nostro Iesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse*). Each of these terms is open to many interpretations, extensions or restrictions. Some of them, including "full power,"²⁵ could be understood as nothing more than an outstanding function within the body of the Church—a power delegated to its outstanding member, to represent the body or to act in behalf of it. Others would rather mean the privilege of an outstanding divine commission. Each of them, taken singly, could express what the Greeks were willing to grant to the Pope, with the possible exception of the "power to convene."²⁶ But it was shown that taken together they could mean more than a

sum of qualities—that they were rather a conceptual organism which was more than the total of its conceptual members.

The man who did this was not Torquemada, the great champion of the Romanist ecclesiology against the conciliarists.²⁷ Another important Dominican, Montenero, took the stand. The persons were different, as were the fronts on which they fought. The treatment of the problem of primacy was very different, but the philosophy and theology applied in both cases was the same. Let us turn to Montenero's two discourses, which are more directly connected with the cause of the union than Torquemada's great defensive discourses against Basel.

Montenero did not have to develop the principles of his master Aquinas;²⁸ rather he had to apply them to the given task. No authorities were quoted except those from or related to the ancient Ecumenical Councils.²⁹ And this restriction of the debate to such authorities as are accepted by both partners is a good Thomistic principle. The second principle which we find applied throughout is that every order of priority is to be explained as an order of causality. But thirdly, a cause which in one order is only the instrumental cause of a primary cause, may become, in its own order and sphere of action, a primary cause with respect to a subsequent cause in the same sphere. This latter cause then cannot be simply subsequent, but must be the instrument or servant of the preceding cause. The idea of a joint power with respect to the same sphere of action is excluded, as is joint causality in such a case. In this all other action is distinguished from the common actions of the persons of the Trinity. This results in a view of the Church in which primary and secondary roles are viewed under the same ratio of headship. It cannot happen, as we see it in conciliarism, that Christ is called the primary head of the Church, because he governs it spiritually, whereas the Pope is considered as the Church's secondary head, because he represents it as a body.³⁰ To Aquinas, everyone who is called a "head" of the Church governs, yet in such a way that Christ is so much the true head of the Church that all "other ministers of the Church . . . cannot be called head, except perhaps *ratione gubernationis*, in which way every prince is called a head."³¹ A theological view of the Church here meets a sociological view. The spiritual government of Christ is so much emphasized that for a moment it seems as if all other possible forms of church government are dismissed as non-essential, only external. But only for a moment! For the result is quite different from the criticism in which conciliarists and, more radically, Wyclif and Hus,³² envisaged competition or conflict between the primary and the secondary power, Christ and Pope. For Thomas, to the degree that the

Pope is under Christ as Christ's instrument, so much is any further "head" of the Church under the Pope, *ratione gubernationis*. This external governing power now, in the synthesis of primary and secondary authorities, is nothing else than the representation to the Church of its own proper head, by those "who are called heads."³³

And now let us take some examples of Montenero's application of these principles.

His interpretation of the Pope's being "successor of Peter and vicar of Jesus Christ" he summarized in a sentence which could remind the fathers of the very purpose and reason of their gathering: "If there were diverse heads, the bond of unity would be broken."³⁴

His exposition of the next words of the *cedula* ("head of the whole Church and father of all Christians") used very conveniently conciliar texts referring to the role of Pope Leo I in times of ecumenical strife. "The Church Universal, however considered, assembled or not, has the relation of members with respect to the Roman Pontiff, and the Roman Pontiff is always set over it like a head over the members."³⁵

When then Montenero came to the word "teacher," he was interrupted by Cesarini, who added some patristic quotations. Was he thinking that the Dominican proceeded in an all too formalistic way? Was not this word an opportunity to show the papal primacy in terms more agreeable to the Greeks, i.e. not in the unity of an organism (*ratione gubernandi*), but rather in terms of the unity of the orthodox truth? Cesarini, who later took the role of a defender of conciliaristic theories, when Torquemada made his solemn speech against Basel, was a different kind of unionist from the Dominicans.³⁶

About the ominous term, the Pope's power to "convene" the Church, Montenero spoke briefly but significantly. He quoted again a Chalcedonian document, in which the word *convocare* does not occur as such. Instead of it, we read the following words, referring to Leo I: "... who hastened to unite the body of the Church" (*qui corpus ecclesiae adunare festinavit*). And he gave only this comment: "Therefore, if Leo, who was the successor of Peter, had [the power] to unite the body of the Church, then, consequently, one may [also] conveniently put 'to convene.'"³⁷ In our comment we try at least to emulate such stupendous briefness. Both verbs, *adunare* and *convocare*, could mean almost the same: "to assemble," "to convene." But *adunare* has a more causal connotation ("to unite"). Apparently Montenero wanted to say: If to the Pope the causal uniting (or at least: keeping in unity) of the body of the Church is ascribed, what then forbids us to ascribe to him also the lesser power of only functionally, instrumentally bringing together that body in a synod?³⁸

In his second discourse, Montenero said that he had not expected doubts about this part of the *cedula* and therefore had been brief.³⁹ But the Greeks had objected to it, and now Montenero began his answer by adding a pseudo-Isidorian testimony, where the word *convocare* is used. Then he declared that the objection of the Greeks was a two-fold one, on the one hand concerning the rights of the Emperor, on the other those of the patriarchs.⁴⁰ Also in other parts of his second discourse, answering other objections, he made it clear that in these two points the whole Greek criticism was focused.⁴¹ And he also made it clear that those were two very different concerns, which had been often in conflict. To illustrate this, he did not fail to speak of the historical background of the conciliar quotations which he gave. He told of heretical emperors and persecuted patriarchs.⁴² Thus he revealed that he could also be a church historian, when he did not need to be too brief. And certainly he was aware of indications that this old Byzantine tension between Church and State was not all a thing of the past.⁴³ But he said also as concisely as possible what one was forced to conclude about the basic character and order of offices in the Church. The act of convening the Church as such derives from an origin which "is called the power of spiritual jurisdiction."⁴⁴ And in this sphere of power, ". . . *prima causa agens pervenit a sede apostolica, . . . principalis causa congregationis in materia ecclesiastica attribuitur auctoritati sedis apostolicae.*" The "worldly arm" acts only "*pro executione,*" we could say, as an instrumental cause, not in behalf of its own power and sphere of action. With respect to the rights of the patriarchs, the idea of a pentarchy (a joint patriarchal government of the Church Universal) was rejected with the usual claim that monarchy is the best form of government. Christ gave the Church a good constitution: "*Christus bene ordinavit ecclesiam.*"⁴⁵ But more than that, Montenero showed that each patriarch had his definite rank not merely in terms of more or less honor but as a particular form of causal relationship of his see to that of Rome. The Church of Alexandria, for example, is "*prima filia ecclesiae Romanae*" because it has a more direct relationship to the founder of the Roman Church than any other church can claim. But why did Constantinople later win the second place? We could guess the answer: The final *consent* of the Pope to this change in the hierarchy in Montenero's argumentation becomes the primary *cause* of this change.⁴⁶ The Pope, so to speak, adopted Constantinople as his daughter.⁴⁷

Now it is clear that all those titles of the Pope proposed in the *cedula* cannot have that "simple word-meaning" (*solum vim vocabulorum dicere*), namely, the meaning of "some reverence, because [the

Pope] is the first among all patriarchs."⁴⁸ In this the Greeks had taken refuge. But Montenero insisted that a hierarchy of honor does not exist which is not at the same time a hierarchy in terms of obedience. For "*caput denotat superioritatem respectu aliorum membrorum*."⁴⁹ There is no patriarch in the Church who is not a member *under* its earthly head, before he may be understood as a head over his particular church.⁵⁰

Montenero ended his speech with the clause: "*Haec sufficient.*" And the interpreter responded: "*Et mihi sufficiunt.*"⁵¹

The short discussion which followed turned on the canonical privileges of the Pope.⁵² But the strength of the Latin position was that it sought the solution of the problem from a quite different angle. The Latin way of arguing about "power in the Church" was to define powers in terms of their relations to the power of Christ as the head of His mystical body.⁵³ The Latins derived their defense of the primacy of the Pope from an interpretation of the way in which he is second to Christ, not as "another head," but as Christ's instrument for governing His Church Universal.

The Western conciliarists saw the relation between the heavenly head of the Church and its earthly head in different ways. But in common with the defenders of Papal supremacy, they argued about this basic relation.⁵⁴ Torquemada in his defenses against their claims pointed out over and over again that for him it was not merely some privilege of the Pope in the Church but the privilege of Christ which was at stake, and that he as a papalist defended the "institution of Christ" and the "imitation of the celestial hierarchy."⁵⁵ The Greeks, in other respects somewhere between these two parties, did not show, in their discussion of papal primacy, anything of such Christological concern. Whatever had driven them to make common cause with Eugene IV and not with Basel, the way in which those Dominicans derived ecclesiological theses from Christological tenets was evidently suspect to them. A deep desire for Christian unity and a warm love of the old institutions and doctrines of the undivided Church were shown often enough by the Greeks, before, during, and after the Council. But the problem of the papal primacy, in their minds, from all that we gather, was unrelated to these deep and original concerns with regard to the Church, whether they were opposed to the union or not.⁵⁶ Thus they could not respond to the appeal of the Latins to consider this problem as a theological one. They did not appeal to Christ as the head of the Church when they made their objections against papal supremacy of jurisdiction.

Only when our problem is seen in the terms in which Aquinas and the Dominicans at Florence saw it, does it become a matter of

vehement debate. But only thus does it become also really meaningful. In questions of the unity of the Church a meaningful discussion, a genuine presentation of the problem, is not a matter of course, but is always an occasion for gratitude.

In the notes, the following abbreviations are used:

Cececoni

E. Cececoni, *Studi storici sul concilio di Firenze* (Florence, 1869).

CF

Concilium Florentinum, documenta et scriptores, editum consilio et impensis Pontificii Instituti Orientalium Studiorum (Rome, 1940ff.):

CF, I/1, I/2, I/3

Vol. I: *Epistolae pontificiae ad concilium Florentinum spectantes*, ed. G. Hofmann, Pars 1 (1940), 2 (1944), 3 (1946);

CF, IV/2

Vol. IV, fasc. 2: Ioannes de Torquemada O. P., *Oratio synodalis de primatu*, ed. E. Candal (1954);

CF, V/1, V/2

Vol. V: *Quae supersunt actorum Graecorum concilii Florentini*, ed. J. Gill, Pars 1 (1953), 2 (1953);

CF, VI

Vol. VI: Andreas de Santacroce, *Acta Latina concilii Florentini*, ed. G. Hofmann (1955).

Denzinger

H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum* (many editions; numbers are given according to those of C. Bannwart or J. B. Umberg).

DThC

M. Jugie, "Primauté dans les églises séparées d' Orient," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, XIII/1 (Paris, 1936), 344-391.

Gill

J. Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge, 1959).

Heiler

F. Heiler, *Altkirchliche Autonomie und päpstlicher Zentralismus* (Munich, 1941).

Heinz-Mohr

G. Heinz-Mohr, *Unitas Christiana; Studien zur Gesellschaftsides des Nikolaus von Kues* (Trier, 1958).

HL

C. J. Hefele, *Histoire des conciles*, nouvelle traduction française.... corrigée et augmentée.... par H. Leclercq, VII/2 (Paris, 1916).

HKFe

G. Hofmann, "Die Konzilsarbeit in Ferrara," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, III (1937), 110-140, 403-455.

HKFI

G. Hofmann, "Die Konzilsarbeit in Florenz," *ibid.*, IV (1938), 157-188, 372-422.

HPC

G. Hofmann, "Papato, conciliarismo, patriarcato," *Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae*, II (1940), 1-82.

Jugie

M. Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin* (Paris, 1941).

Syropoulos

Syropoulos, *Vera historia unionis non verae*, ed. R. Creighton (Hague, 1660).

Tierney

B. Tierney, *The Foundations of the Conciliar Theory* (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, New Ser., IV, Cambridge, 1955).

Viller

M. Viller, "La question de l'union des Eglises entre Grecs et Latins depuis le concile de Lyon jusqu'à celui de Florence," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, XVII (1921), 260-305; XVIII (1922), 20-60.

Not available:

G. Hofmann, "Quo modo formula definitionis concilii Florentini de potestate plena papae praeparata fuerit," *Acta Academiae Velehradensis*, XIV (1938), 138-148.

F. Heiler, "Was lehrt das Konzil von Florenz für die kirchliche Einigungsarbeit?," *Eine Heilige Kirche*, XXI (1939), 183-193.

1. Viller, particularly 283f., 68ff., 83ff.

2. *Ibid.*, 78.

3. *Ibid.*, 83ff. Also Th. Frommann, *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Florentiner Kircheneinigung* (Halle, 1872), 86ff.

4. In May of 1438, at the third conference held between the Latin and the Greek delegations, Cardinal Cesarini indicated, as chief differences between the Churches, the same four points which finally were included in the decree of union: (A) the procession of the Holy Spirit, (B) the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist, (C) the Purgatory, (D) the authority of the Pope (Gill, 116; HL, 967f.; HKFe, 417). During the following discussions and negotiations, two related problems were added: (a) the addition of the *filioque* to the Creed

- (Syropoulos, VII, 9, p. 199), and (b) the "form of the Eucharist," i.e. the problem of the Greek *epiclesis* after the words of consecration (Gill, 266f.). After the settlement on (A), the Latins submitted *cedulae* (concise statements for the discussion and for the preparation of the decree of union) on (C), (a), (B), and (D) (Gill, 267, 274, n. 1; HL, 1013f.; HKF1, 396f.). After agreement was reached, on June 27, 1439, Cesarini gave the Latin synod a retrospective account of all the negotiations (CF, VI, 253-256; Gill, 285f.). At first he listed (A), (a), (B), (C) and (D) as the traditional differences. His remarks about the last point begin as follows: "Ultima differentia fuit de primatu, et haec visa est quoad humanitatem difficilior, quia libenter subditi a capite deviant, et in rei veritate usque nunc non bene senserunt de potestate Romani pontificis, dicentes, quod erat ut caput quo ad unum totum, ut decanus. Et auditis sacris scripturis et sacris conciliis visa est veritas, quod sedes apostolica et Romanus pontifex est successor Petri" (CF, VI, 255). In his letters of July 7 (CF, I/2, documents 178-193), Eugene IV mentioned only (A) and (D) as the outstanding features of the preceding day's union. The Greeks often gave expression to the opinion that (A), with the inclusion of (a), was the only serious issue between the Churches. See, e.g., Cececoni, 115f., with document LXXVIII; Gill, 386. In the debate about (a), on Nov. 15, 1438, Mark Eugenicius said that he would have preferred even the discussion of (D) to that of (A) and (a) (HL, 984). After the council, the Greek opponents of the union had different opinions about the importance of (D). See Viller, 80, n. 1; 83, n. 3; also Jugie, 366; and cf. below, note 56.
5. On June 12, 1439, after the Pope had spoken about (B), (C), (D), (a) and (b), the leading Greek prelates expressed their opinion as follows: (B) and (C) are relatively unimportant; nor is there anything in (a) and (b) that could preclude the union. Only (D) was not mentioned (Gill, 272; HL, 1019f.). On June 9, at a similar occasion, the Greeks had avoided any discussion of (D) (HKF1, 396f.).
 6. The original contention of the Greeks was not that a council was a "more direct" or "more certain" representation of the Church than the Church's hierarchical heads (see below, note 7), rather, that an equal participation of all churches or patriarchies was the only way in which a council would win recognition as having been ecumenical. Thus for the Greeks, before, during and

after the Council of Ferrara and Florence, it was such ecumenicity which made a council superior to any decisions of the Roman Church or of the Pope. In this light, the question could be raised whether or not the Council of Ferrara and Florence had been or would be more than a Latin enterprise. Cf., e.g., Viller, 25; CF, V, 159f.; CF, VI, 51; Gill, 377. On this line, the Greek criticism of the self-sufficiency of the Pope could come close to ideas of Western conciliarists, even of Marsilius of Padua (Viller, 25). On the other side, for Western conciliarism a reunited Church was by no means a presupposition for declaring a council as ecumenical or for proclaiming the council's superiority over the Pope. The *causa unionis* was only one among other concerns of the Western reform councils, and not the primary one. Cf., e.g., Cececoni, 41. However, many conciliarists were zealous champions of the cause of union (Viller, 300, 30f.), and this led them, notably Cusanus, to a better appreciation of the Greek form of opposition against papal supremacy (Heiler, 300ff., particularly 306-312). See further below, note 10.

7. According to Tierney, Western conciliarism has its roots in the understanding of the Church as a corporation. This concept was developed by canonists of the 13th century. In this approach, it became possible to understand any "head" of a church, including the Pope, from a new angle, as the representative of a corporative authority which originally belonged to "all members." This had little to do with the traditional concept of the *corpus mysticum*, in which the Pope did not represent the members, but represented Christ, the invisible head, to the members. See particularly Tierney, 132ff. The leading thinkers of conciliarism had moments of keen awareness of the tension between those two different conceptions of the Church. However, they did not succeed in expressing their objections to papal primacy in theological terms. Their claim that a council had a priority in being assisted by the Holy Spirit and in interpreting God's law did not make up for the preponderance of juristic arguments (and sometimes of considerations of mere expediency) in their various and always shifting assessments of the Pope's role in the Church. Their theological consideration of Christ as the primary head of the Church put both council and Pope on a secondary level of representation. But in working out the reasons for the superiority of a council over a Pope,

- a quite different set of reasons was used. See Heinz-Mohr, 136ff., 149ff.
8. Thus written by Emperor John VIII as early as 1422 (Cecconi, document IV; cf. documents XIV, XXXVII, LXVII, etc.). See also the explanation of the Greek delegation at Ferrara why public sessions should no longer be suspended (Gill, 128), despite the Emperor's opinion that the Western princes were not sufficiently represented (cf. Gill, 88, 106, 111f.).
 9. See e.g., Cecconi, 76, 108, 154ff., with documents XXX, XXXII, LX, LXI, CVI, CVII; Gill, 66.
 10. Cusanus' idea of *concordia* and his concern with its best representation and symbolization was from the beginning prior to his conciliarist theories. See Heinz-Mohr, particularly 140ff. Thus he could use the terminology of conciliarism in explaining the representative character of the papacy, without ever thinking, though, that a council is the Church's representation in such an absolute degree that the papacy is its mere function without representative power of its own. To Cusanus, the Pope was always more than a mere member or, at best, a *caput ministeriale* of the Church (*ibid.*, 74, 164f.). His decision against the remonstrants of Basel was for the sake of "universa . . . ecclesia per orbem dispersa, quae schisma noluit et Graecam unionem optavit" (*ibid.*, 147). This very concern he had already expressed in his *De concordantia catholica*: "Inter pares apostolos Petrum ad praesidendum electum, ut capite constituto schismatis tollatur occasio" (I, 6). This was certainly more than a mere adjustment of the *inter pares* to the traditional primacy of honor granted to the Pope. As important as that *inter pares* was, in Cusanus' conciliarist phase, it was overshadowed, in his later defense of the cause of Florence, by the emphasis on *capite constituto*. It even underwent a change of interpretation: now the unique role of Peter no longer had its relation to and counterpoise in possible other forms of representation of the Church, but only in the Church herself: "Petrus est complicatio ecclesiae; ecclesia est explicatio Petri" (Heiler, 317). For Cusanus' development, see, besides the book of Heinz-Mohr, Heiler, 300ff. For Cesarini, see CF, IV/2, xxxiiff. Even the Duke of Milan was utterly unwilling to accept "another Pope" from the Council of Basel, as long as Eugene IV was alive (Gill, 140).
 11. As far as they understood the ecumenicity of the Councils of Constance and Basel independently of the Greek idea of an ecumenical council, they regarded the Pope as the head (however limited by the privileges of a council) of the whole Church. Thus they shared the traditional Western view of the union as a *reductio* to the Roman Church. See Viller, 304.
 12. In the problem of Purgatory (with related eschatological questions), the Greeks were neither unanimous nor very definite. The problem of the matter of the Eucharist was not solved in terms of right or wrong. The other two problems (addition to the Creed, and form of the Eucharist) caused many difficulties, but were finally dropped from the list of those items which were to be defined in the decree of union.
 13. June 9 until before June 16. See Gill, 266ff.; HL, 1012ff.; HKF1, 396ff.
 14. Account of the *Acta Latina*: CF, VI, 231-236; also HPC, 41-47. The *Acta Graeca* only mention this and the following discourses, without quoting from them (CF, V/2, 448). The text of the original *cedula* can only be reconstructed from the quotations in Montenero's discourse, according to the *Acta Latina*.
 15. CF, VI, 236-239; cf. CF, V/2, 448.
 16. For the date, see Gill, 278, n. 2. Montenero's second discourse is printed in CF, VI, 241-247 (also, with some confusions of pages and lines, HPC, 248-252). Cf. CF, V/2, 450f.
 17. June 16-27: Gill, 273ff.; HL, 1020ff.; HKF1, 400ff. On June 22, a deadlock was reached, with the jurisdictional understanding of papal primacy and the right of convoking councils at stake. The Emperor threatened to leave the council. Gill, 282; HL, 1025.
 18. June 27-July 4: Gill, 287ff.; HL, 1028ff., 1045f.; HKF1, 409ff. All of these formal difficulties had to do with the privileges of Pope, Emperor and patriarchs: who of them was to be mentioned in the initial words of the decree—whether, in the definition of the papal primacy, "the writings of the Saints" (i.e., of the Church Fathers) should not be replaced by the mentioning of the conciliar canons ("the Emperor objecting that, if some Saints wrote in exaggeratedly honourable terms of a Pope, was that to count as the ground of a privilege" [Gill, 288])—and finally, whether the decree should have "without infringement of all the privileges and rights" (of the Eastern patriarchs), or the same without "all." In all these three points, the Pope yielded to the wishes of the Greeks!
 19. CF, V/2, 459-467; VI, 260-266; also HL, 1037-1044, Gill, 412-415, and (giving only the text of the four defini-

- tions) Denzinger, nr. 691-694. Cf. Gill, 291ff.; HL, 1030ff.
20. See above, notes 17 and 18.
21. See above, note 14, last sentence.
22. "... quemadmodum *etiam* in gestis yemenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur. Renovantes in super ordinem traditum in canonibus caeterorum venerabilium patriarcharum, ut patriarcha Constantinopolitanus secundus sit post sanctissimum Romanum pontificem, tertius vero Alexandrinus, quartus autem Antiochenus, et quintus Hierosolymitanus, salvis videlicet privilegiis *omnibus* et iuribus eorum." See above, note 18, for the *omnibus*. The Greek equivalent of the *etiam* is Kai, and some renderings of the Latin text (though none of the official copies of the decree) have *et* instead of *etiam*. For the discussion of this and related problems, see HPC, 65ff.; HL, 1044ff.; Heiler, 297, n. 62a.
23. Denzinger, nr. 466.
24. Of course the dignity of "successor of Peter" is also expressed in both documents.
25. See Tierney, 179ff.
26. The title *vicarius Christi* sounded rather unfamiliar to the Greeks. However, it seems that Macarius of Ancyra, who questioned it, was rather an exception. See DThC, 373.
27. See HPC, 9ff.; CF, IV/2 (with bibliography and introduction).
28. See M. Mineuzzi, *La dottrina teologica di Giovanni di Montenero*, O. P. (Bari, 1941; unfortunately not available to me).
29. Quite differently, of course, from Torquemada's use of Aquinas and other Western sources in his contesting the tenets of conciliarism.
30. See above, note 7. Andrew da Santa Croce, in his *Dialogus de primatu*, with which he opens the *Acta Latina* (CF, VI, 2-24), made the usefulness of this point very clear, as he used it for showing difficulties and inconsistencies of the conciliarist theory. See, e.g., Lc. 4, 5, 14.
31. *Quaest. disp. de veritate*, q. 29, a. 4: "Ad secundum dicendum, quod alii ministri ecclesiae non disponunt nec operantur ad spiritualem vitam quasi ex propria virtute, sed virtute aliena; Christus autem virtute propria. Et inde est, quod Christus poterat per seipsum effectum sacramentorum praebere, quia tota efficacia sacramentorum in eo originaliter erat; non autem hoc possunt alii, qui sunt ecclesiae ministri; unde non possunt dici caput, nisi forte ratione gubernationis, sicut quilibet princeps dicitur caput." Here, as well as in *Summa theol.*, III, q. 8, a. 6, at a certain moment in the movement of thought, it looks as if the possibility of "heads other than Christ" should not only be explained in purely institutional, functional terms, but should also (more radically than in average conciliarism!) be expressly excluded from theological legalization. But then it becomes clear that subordination is at the same time derivation and participation. Members of the one, principal head and foundation may become *capita* and *fundamenta* in their turn, since there there is "auctoritas non solum principalis, sed etiam secundaria" (*ibid.*, ad 3). The papal hierarchy is considered as a likeness of the angelic hierarchy in its using intermediate, instrumental causes (*ibid.*, II-II, q. 112, a. 2, ad 2). In every given order it is true that "unitatis congruentior causa est unus quam multi" (*Summa contra gentes*, IV, 76). Thus the papal monarchy has a ministerial relation to the monarchy of Christ, and this makes the Pope's office comparable with that of the Holy Spirit—the *filiusque* and the papal *plenitudo potestatis* become analogous problems! (*Contra errores Graecorum*, ed. Mandonnet, III, 322). However, the ministry of the Pope is distinguished from that of the Holy Spirit by its own, inferior sphere of action: "secundum visibilem naturam" (*Summa theol.*, III, q. 8, a. 1, ad 3). Thus there are never two heads on the same level and with the same respect, unless there be confusion and schism (*ibid.*, II-II, q. 39, a. 1, resp.). The same principle of order is applicable to a bishop's relation to the Pope. (see below, note 33).
32. See Denzinger, nr. 588, 621, 633, 635-639, 641, 643 646f., 650, 655, and particularly 653 and 654.
33. Cf. above, note 31. *Summa theol.*, III, q. 8, a. 6, resp.: "Interior autem influxus gratiae non est ab aliquo, nisi a solo Christo, cuius humanitas ex hoc, quod est divinitati coniuncta, habet virtutem iustificandi; sed influxus in membra ecclesiae, quantum ad exteriorem gubernationem, potest aliis convenire; et secundum hoc aliqui alii possunt dici capita ecclesiae, secundum illud Amos 6: 'Optimates capita populorum.' Differenter tamen a Christo; primo quidem quantum ad hoc, quod Christus est caput omnium eorum, qui ad ecclesiam pertinent, secundum omnem locum et tempus et statum; alii autem homines dicuntur capita secundum quaedam specialia loca, sicut episcopi suarum ecclesiarum; vel etiam secundum determinatum tempus, sicut papa est caput totius ecclesiae, scilicet tempore sui pontificatus; et secundum determinatum statum, prout scilicet

sunt in statu viatoris; alio modo, quia Christus est caput ecclesiae propria virtute et auctoritate, alii vero dicuntur capita, in quantum vicem gerunt Christi."

34. CF, VI, 232.
35. *Ibid.*, 233.
36. See above, note 10.
37. CF, VI, 235.
38. Another example of Montenero's method in the same discourse: in his explanation of the word *regendi* (*ibid.*, 235), he used a paragraph of Leo I (*Sermones*, III, 3, PL 54: 146B-C) in which the *principaliter regere* of Christ is said to take place exclusively through Peter. However, Leo speaks only of a *consortium* of powers and gifts and of a hierarchy of original power followed by subsequent, derived powers, but not of different spheres of action and causality.
39. CF, VI, 244. Disposition of the whole discourse: *Introductory problem*: The Greeks objected to Montenero's use of papal letters as testimonies. His answer: Only such letters were quoted as were received, with great reverence, by ecumenical councils. Due to their priority in the order of things, these letters were not only equal to the canons of the councils, but of greater authority. *Ibid.*, 241f. *First problem*: Question: Do the titles *pater*, *doctor*, and particularly *caput*, really imply more than reverence toward the Pope? Answer: They mean an order of obedience. The other words are to be explained in terms of the word *caput*. From this the jurisdictional character of the papacy follows necessarily. *Ibid.*, 243f. *Second problem*: The Greeks questioned the word *convocandi* (not only its possible interpretation). In his answer, Montenero questions the privileges of emperors and patriarchs, insofar as they would imply equality with or even superiority over the Pope. *Ibid.*, 245-247.
40. *Ibid.*, 245.
41. When he dealt with the question of whether the titles *pater*, *doctor*, and particularly *caput* were mere expressions of reverence toward the Pope or more than that (*ibid.*, 243f.), he expounded at first the superiority of Peter and his successors over the apostles and their successors, then he discussed the relation between spiritual and secular powers.
42. Athanasius, Chrysostom and Flavianus, the emperors who persecuted them, and the Popes who defended them are mentioned (*ibid.*, 244f.).
43. Cf. Gill, xiv, 104, 114f., 142, 171. Syropoulos is particularly rich in hints at this tension. Note especially his opinion that Patriarch Joseph II favoured the union in order to get relief from the tyranny of the Emperor (IV, 19, 92).
44. CF, VI, 244.
45. *Ibid.*, 245f.
46. "Postea Leo consensit et Iustinianus postea [!] fecit legem, quod Constantinopolitana esset secunda, in titulo de sacrosanctis ecclesiis, in lege Sancimus." *Ibid.*, 246.
47. "Ergo secundum haec iura antiqua etiam illa ecclesia est filia Romanae ecclesiae." *Ibid.*
48. *Ibid.*, 243.
49. *Ibid.*
50. *Ibid.*
51. *Ibid.*, 247.
52. *Ibid.*
53. Those of the Latin theologians who expounded the papal primacy against the conciliaristic theories had more opportunity of developing this way of argumentation. Cf. above, note 29. For Andrew da Santa Croce, see above, note 30. For Torquemada's way of argumentation, see, e.g., CF, IV/2, 15-17, 40, 65, and below, note 55. In his discourse at the diet at Mainz, Torquemada used, among other testimonies for the Pope being the "head" of the Church, Aquinas, *Summa theol.*, II-II, q. 39. See HPC, 26. It is interesting to note that the bull *Unam sanctam* of Boniface VIII (which Torquemada used several times in his discourses) is, to my knowledge, the first official document of the Roman Church in which (1) the Pope's headship in its relation to Christ's headship, and (2) the Pope's headship in its relation to the Church (or to the churches other than the Roman) are expressly connected and viewed together.
54. Cf. above, notes 7, 10, and 11.
55. For Torquemada's use of the Pseudo-Dionysian principle of regarding the earthly hierarchy as the image of the celestial hierarchy, see HPC, 16f.
56. See DThC, 357ff.; Jugie, 364ff.; by the same author, *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia*

Catholica dissidentium, I, (Paris, 1926), 110ff; IV (Paris, 1931), 320ff. One thing stands out clearly enough: the Greeks denied the privilege of infallibility to the Pope, whatever else they were thinking of his role in the Church. But the infallibility was not yet at stake in the time of the union of Florence, however much it was already then becoming visible as an implication of the Roman ecclesiology. (See CF, IV/2, xxxi, about Torquemada's use of that term.) Since in the Greek thinking the Church as *corpus mysticum* and the constitution of the Church were two separate

loci, they were not able to deal with the Roman claims at their ecclesiological point of origin. With respect to questions of episcopal primacy, they used the word "head" in various ways. But I was not able to find any example where this problem is judged in the light of the original headship of Christ—unless one wants to take the frequent denial of the title "head" to all ecclesiastical hierarchs as something more than a general humble insight into the secondarity of the *locus de primatibus* in comparison with the spiritual ecclesiology. For the whole question, see also Viller.

JOHN WYCLIF AND THE TRADITION OF BIBLICAL AUTHORITY

WILLIAM MALLARD, *Candler School of Theology*

John Wyclif is remembered today as an innovator. Scholars have not misled us at that point. W. W. Shirley in 1858 stated his role as a pioneer without predecessors: "On most of us the dim image looks down, like the portrait of the first of a long line of kings, without personality or expression—he is the first of the reformers."¹ The English Bible translated under his inspiration is a monument that stands apart. It established no direct connection with any English version that either preceded or followed it.² No prior medieval schoolman quite paralleled Wyclif in setting forth Holy Scripture alone as the final religious authority. Nor had any university leader so encouraged unlicensed preachers to expound the Bible to commoners.³

This paper proposes nevertheless that Wyclif belonged to an orthodox tradition. He arose from the vitality of medieval Catholic culture. He cannot be understood apart from that culture, even though he is accused of rejecting it. In particular, Wyclif's view of the Bible presupposed ancient and medieval achievements. His thinking incorporated centuries of Christian scholarship. Although his works plainly reveal their indebtedness, tradition in him has been obscured by those who have connected Wyclif exclusively with the coming Protestant churches. Wyclif was the "Morning Star of the Reformation," but he was also the last of the great medieval schoolmen. His work rebukes the easy separation often made between medieval and Reformation history. The study of his views is therefore an aid in realizing the continuity of the Church's heritage. Wyclif and the Churches of the Reformation grew out of medieval Christendom. Protestant historians err if they see the immediate roots of the Reformation only in late medieval heresies. Wyclif is actually another figure in the tradition of orthodox Bible study that extended through the ancient, the medieval, and the Reformation Churches. His work points to the best that preceded him as well as the best that was to come. In this paper Wyclif's Biblical view and his heritage in Biblical study are presented in that entire scope, and the application of the last two sections is to the technique of interpretation by allegory.

The Affirmation of Scriptural Authority

Wyclif's statements on the authority of the Bible reach a climax in his treatise *The Truth of Holy Scripture*. Here he asserts the reliability of every portion of the sacred text. "Any part of Holy Scrip-

ture is true according to the excellence of the Divine Word."⁴ The Bible is therefore the only source of doctrine that will insure the health of the Church and the salvation of the faithful.⁵ The Holy Spirit was the source of inspiration. And since the Holy Spirit is one with Christ, the truth of the Bible rests entirely upon the centrality of Christ himself. The Bible—God's Law—is true because the revelation in Christ is true. Wyclif insists therefore that the Bible need not be supplemented by any later tradition in order to be sufficient for salvation. He is thoroughly scornful of theologians who slight Holy Scripture. If any such persons find contradiction or errors in the Bible, their own ignorance is at fault rather than the sacred text. Wyclif concludes that of all possible authorities Holy Scripture is pre-eminent for every Christian and constitutes his Rule of Faith.⁶ Even in works much earlier than the mature *Truth of Holy Scriptures* Wyclif showed his preference for the authority of the Bible. His position had developed over many years.⁷

Despite the revolutionary character of Wyclif's view, he was thoroughly grounded in traditional thought. In *The Truth of Holy Scripture* Wyclif fills the text with reference to his favorite Church Father, Augustine of Hippo.⁸ Almost every page of the treatise presents such a quotation. The references from Augustine assert the spiritual truth of all the words of Scripture and affirm in Scripture the foundation of all Christian doctrine. "See that Augustine considers them as blasphemers who deny the statements of the Scriptures." And he quotes Augustine directly: "If reason is set against the authority of the Divine Scriptures, no matter how keen it may be, it fails of accuracy, for it cannot be true."⁹ Wyclif adds the tart comment: "And it is not to be supposed that this holy doctor should be deceived by flattery, or that he should only understand concerning Scripture that it is a book made of the skins of dead animals."¹⁰ Wyclif no doubt failed to grasp all the implications of Augustine's position. Certainly Augustine thought of the credibility of Scripture as dependent upon the authority of the Church Universal.¹¹ Wyclif's thinking at this point showed the impact of the contemporary Babylonian Captivity and of the Great Schism of the Papacy. With the hierarchy in a scandalous plight, Wyclif declared that the meaning of the Bible is plain and convincing to any prayerful seeker apart from the Church's official interpretation. His five-fold rule for reading the truth of Scripture included the following: obtain a reliable text, understand the logic of Scripture, compare the parts of Scripture with one another, maintain an attitude of humble seeking, and receive the instruction of the Spirit.¹² The community of faith is not specifically mentioned. Augustine's thought is so rich and varied that Wyclif's views are not adequate to its fullness. Along with his rules for the

proper exegesis of Scripture Augustine declared that the foundation for a true reading of any Biblical passage is the individual's love for God.¹³ At the same time he located love within the visible Church and heavily supported the authority of the hierarchy. Wyclif's circumstances pressed him to discount official priestly interpretations. He nevertheless accepted Augustine's primary beliefs on Biblical authority. He knew that reason could properly interpret Scripture only if the spirit of love and humility guided the reader. Notably, his Augustinianism became so prominent as to win him the title of "John, Son of Augustine."¹⁴

Wyclif held that Augustine's authority in support of Scripture reached out to other great doctors Augustinian in their views. Wyclif cites Anselm of Canterbury, Hugh of St.-Victor, Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, and "other doctors," as following Augustine's position.¹⁵ At another point he names Ambrose, Jerome, Gregory and Bernard as revered fathers who took the same view of the excellence of Scripture.¹⁶ He obviously never hesitates to call to his support the leading names in the Church's memory.

The Scope of Biblical Authority

In addition to affirming the Bible's authority, Wyclif declared the broad scope of that authority. According to the most learned doctors of the tradition, Holy Scripture contained not only all Christian doctrine, but all truth generally. It was a "divine encyclopedia," a *summa* of the wisdom of God. The Bible included mathematics, philosophy, and natural history. Although the core of Scripture could be grasped by the simplest peasant, the most learned scholar could use all his knowledge in penetrating the hidden truths. Wyclif supported the idea of the "divine encyclopedia." He states that "since . . . in Holy Scripture there is all truth, it is clear that all disputation—all meaning of conclusions or theory of discussion—which does not have its origin in Holy Scripture, is profane."¹⁷ He sets forth Augustine's opinion that all law, all philosophy, all logic and all ethics are found in Holy Scripture.¹⁸ Concerning philosophy Wyclif states that there is no correct philosophizing that disagrees with Holy Scripture. ". . . I consider it indeed certain that it is not philosophical to deny the creation of the world with all its parts, or to deny the uncreated Trinity . . ."¹⁹ His stand was significant because of the skepticism that had invaded so much of fourteenth-century philosophy. In the discipline of natural history Wyclif likewise found a method for expounding the Biblical symbols of inorganic objects, animals, and plants. Man's life finds a reflection in the universe. As Aristotle understood, man is a microcosm. Spiritual truths can naturally assume the figures of the natural world. "Thus [says Wyclif] natural philosophy is useful

for the understanding of Scripture."²⁰ Commenting on Canticles 2:12 ("The voice of the turtle is heard in our land"), Wyclif notes that the turtle is said constantly to sigh on account of the absence of its mate. The member of the Church thus sighs for Christ.²¹ This may be compared with Augustine's discussion of the serpent in his *Christian Doctrine*. Knowledge that the natural serpent presents his whole body in order to protect his head enables us to see the Church of the martyrs dying for the sake of Christ. Knowledge that the serpent sheds his skin illumines Paul's "old man" and "new man." Augustine thus opens the meaning of the Gospel verse, "Be ye wise as serpents" (Matthew 10:16).²²

The idea of the "divine encyclopedia" arose out of Biblical exegesis by allegory. Alexandria in Egypt had promoted the allegorical method through the work of Philo and Origen. It was Origen who insured the triumph of mystical allegory over the opposition of the school at Antioch.²³ Reading allegorically gave to the most matter-of-fact passage an illumination that was moral, doctrinal, or mystical. Augustine also highly favored allegory. His final acceptance of Christianity had depended in part upon the skillful allegorizing of Bishop Ambrose.²⁴ Both Augustine and Jerome believed that in addition to understanding Christianity a good allegorist must know the secular liberal arts. Holy Scripture contained all the arts either plainly stated or hidden within the mystical allegories. Only secular studies revealed the allegorical significance of all the objects mentioned in Scripture. The natural understanding of musical instruments, numbers, animals, and plants provided clues to spiritual meaning. Augustine's support of secular education meant that allegorical Bible study should employ the finest wisdom offered by contemporary culture.²⁵ Students of allegory throughout the medieval period inherited Augustine's notion of the Bible as a treasury of knowledge.

Soon after Augustine, Cassiodorus Senator combined in his monastic *Institutes* an introduction to both the liberal arts and Scriptural exegesis. A guide to the allegorical levels or "senses" of Scripture was already in use among Christian monks. Cassiodorus added an Augustinian program of secular studies in order that the monk might increase his ability in Biblical reading.²⁶ The monastery preserved this heritage of exegesis during the early middle ages, making possible the Biblical work of the Carolingian Renaissance and ultimately of the universities.²⁷ The Abbey of St.-Victor at Paris was an important twelfth-century center for the pursuit of allegory and the liberal arts. Hugh of St.-Victor devised an elaborate curriculum in which the student employed secular studies in reading the entire Bible three times, once for each of three different senses. The learning that Hugh

expected was almost prohibitive except for the most talented student. Knowledge was growing, and mastery of the arts and sciences made extraordinary demands. Hugh's curriculum perished by its own weight, proving the practical difficulty of regarding the study of the Bible as the study of everything in general.²⁸ The value of the liberal arts in relation to Bible study was fortunately continued among outstanding university men including Hugh of St.-Cher among the Dominicans, Roger Bacon of Oxford, and Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln.²⁹ Wyclif joined his predecessors in declaring that Scripture was a "divine encyclopedia," but he did not attempt to make the Bible a textbook for the entire university curriculum. The full program of Hugh of St.-Victor was hardly feasible.

The Application of Scriptural Authority to Christian Instruction

The attention of Wyclif's reform centered upon the needs of the Church. Biblical interpretation was not the practical method for every university discipline, but it was determinative for theology and ethics. The problem was to provide effective instruction in Christianity. Wyclif desired that Bible study be applied to every question of faith and morals. The principal demand of his reform was that Church and State be loyal to the example of Jesus. The authority of the Bible was therefore an authority chiefly for religious teaching. Allegory was a method of interpretation that rendered the whole Bible useful in homiletics, in theology, and in civil and ecclesiastical law. Wyclif's works in these areas show his determination to present the Bible directly. Holy Scripture was a hub from which immediately radiated law, doctrine, and preaching.³⁰

Wyclif's concern that the whole of Scripture be serviceable in Christian teaching links him again to the allegorizing of numerous holy doctors. Outstanding teachers in the Church's memory had always maintained a unity of both Testaments. Since the beginning the Church had determined to keep the whole Bible intact within Christian instruction. The message of a new life in Christ appeared throughout both Testaments if allegory were applied to the difficult passages. Origen often used allegorical teaching to reconcile difficult Old Testament passages with the Gospel.³¹ Augustine and Pope Gregory I agreed with the allegorical method of instruction. Gregory's situation demanded preaching that would meet the hardships of his people in fallen Rome. He believed that a passage would be always correctly interpreted if the inspired exegesis met the special need facing the preacher. Divine inspiration would reveal every helpful application. By allegorizing, Gregory could preach many times on the book of Job or of Ezekiel and in every sermon speak to the broadest varieties of human need. Even the number of cows and sheep pos-

sessed by Job was meaningful.³² Gregory built series of interpretations by the use of what he called "testimonies." In a testimony one passage of Scripture illuminated another because their allegorical meanings were the same. A third passage might have relationship to the second, and a "chain" would be begun. Such a method of instruction was congenial to Wyclif himself, who shows by numerous references his approval of Gregory's work. A typical case (one of forty-one references to Gregory in *The Truth of Holy Scripture*) is Wyclif's allusion to the commentary on Job in which "a lion signifies, according to simple grammatical notation, a four-footed beast, but according to theological matters it signifies in addition now Christ, now the devil, as Gregory shows. . ."³³

Spinning allegories helped preserve both the authority of the whole Bible and the unique spiritual power of the Gospel. If the Gospel could be discovered throughout the sacred text by means of allegory, then no serious objection could be raised to the inspiration of the entire canon. Origen, Augustine, Gregory, and Wyclif all knew the Church's need of the Old Testament. But they were equally certain that the Gospel of Christ was the essence of all helpful instruction. The Gospel could be the core of every Biblical teaching if allegory were used. The entire sacred canon could be profitably studied if allegory transformed the literal meaning into Christian wisdom.

Medieval scholars prior to Wyclif employed the same method. The work of Hugh of St.-Victor has already been described in the matter of the "divine encyclopedia." The third part of Hugh's curriculum was the tropological or moral sense of Scripture. Expanding the moral sense gave rise to the work of three Parisian scholars of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries—Peter Comestor, Peter Cantor, and Stephen Langton, who have been called the "Biblical moral school."³⁴ Their moral allegories on Scripture were the lectures they used at the University of Paris. Not only parish preaching, but the University lecture was to teach Scripture through instructive allegory. The point is important because the creative university teaching of the thirteenth century deserted exegesis for the dialectics of Aristotle. Maurice de Sully, able preacher and Bishop of Paris in the late twelfth century, extended the use of the moral sense in his remarkable vernacular sermons to the people of the city.³⁵ Robert Grosseteste was one thirteenth-century bishop and scholar who refused to allow the separation of theology and preaching from Biblical exegesis. At Oxford he lectured to the Franciscan monks and trained them thoroughly in theological exposition of the Bible. Grosseteste warred against laxity among the clergy so that Wyclif thought of him as one of his most noble fore-

runners. In *The Truth of Holy Scripture* Wyclif variously introduces Grosseteste to support the allegorical use of certain names in Scripture, to comment on the authority of the Easter story, to affirm the inner witness of Scriptural truth, and to describe the four ages of mankind.³⁶ References to Grosseteste throughout Wyclif's works are a part of his appeal to tradition.³⁷

Among Wyclif's own works his Latin sermons best reveal direct commentary upon quoted Scripture. He deserts the scholastic sermon pattern in favor of the "postill" as employed by Hugh of St.-Cher—commentary introduced within the text itself so that the reading of one continuous line follows both Scripture and comment. Even though Wyclif speaks of his "plain sermons for the people," he did not succeed in keeping his homilies free of scholastic traits. Scholastic arguments constantly obscure the simple message. The English sermons include much of the same technical matter, indicating their use as a manual for other preachers rather than homilies for the common folk. Wyclif nevertheless proves his intention of directly expounding Scripture. His foundation is always the sacred text. He was certain that the truth of Christ resided in the statements of Holy Scripture and that the task of the effective preacher was to set forth those statements.³⁸ In choosing portions of Scripture for his sermons Wyclif followed the lections of the liturgical year. He did not use only those parts of Scripture that promised best to suit his purposes, but rather adhered to the traditional Christian calendar. His willingness to preach upon any passage presented to him shows his confidence in the unity of the whole Bible as "God's Law." The same essential message was contained in any part of Holy Scripture—the Old Testament or the New. If it was not stated explicitly, then it was present allegorically and could be disclosed by the preacher. Wyclif's sermons reveal countless examples of allegorical treatment for the sake of Gospel instruction. One particular homily on Isaiah 60 shows most clearly the treatment of the Old Testament by allegorical reference to the New. References to camels, dromedaries, and flocks are taken not only to predict the coming of the Magi, but through mystical commentary to indicate apostles, martyrs, and confessors.³⁹ Elsewhere, Old Testament manna is a type of the Eucharist, while Abraham's two sons signify the two Testaments.⁴⁰ Allegorizing is used frequently for both New Testament and Old Testament passages.

The sermons best reveal Wyclif's method of interpretation, but all of his works so often refer to Scripture that they guarantee his desire to be thoroughly Biblical. Even in his very early *Logica* Wyclif announced that he was composing a "logic of holy writ."⁴¹ Wyclif also looked to the Bible as the immediate source of guidance

in civil and ecclesiastical law. The advanced stage of his reforming work ended in the project of a Bible translation undertaken by his followers. The purpose of such a translation was undoubtedly manifold. As a treasured possession of the upper classes the English Bible could guide the lay leadership in reforming the Church. The common folk would have the simple and direct injunctions of Jesus to lead them to salvation. These would be especially appropriate purposes in a day when French was rapidly disappearing as a spoken language even among the learned.⁴² But neither of these aims would require a sentence by sentence translation of the entire Bible. The Wyclif Bible testified to an extraordinary reverence for the authority of the complete text. Such reverence recalls the long tradition of Biblical authority already examined here. Miss Deanesly helps by suggesting that the completed text of the Bible might have been intended to serve as word-by-word basis for a new canon law.⁴³ The canon law of the Pope was assuredly the authority for many practices despised by Wyclif. If the English translation were designed to promote the compilation of a new law for the Church, the allegorical method would undoubtedly serve to render the Bible into serviceable law. The same project might have been undertaken for a correction of civil law. Certainly Wyclif's regard for Scriptural authority knew no bounds, and his desire that government derive power from the reign of God shapes his treatise *On Civil Dominion*.⁴⁴

Wyclif's conviction that the entire Bible—"God's Law"—should be the source-book for Christian instruction puts him plainly in an orthodox line of succession. His sermons and treatises show conclusively his dependence upon the mainstream of orthodox expositors who had gone before him. They desired that Scripture should be in fact and in spirit the substance of Christian teaching. Wyclif agreed. They recognized allegory as fulfilling the particular needs of teaching and preaching. Wyclif acknowledged allegory for the same purposes. Unlike them he used Scripture to support heretical opinions. He also surpassed them in denying the Church's official interpretation of Scripture. His assumptions and methods were nevertheless the same as theirs, and without them his use of Scripture would not have been possible.

Wyclif's place in the heritage of the allegorical school has been questioned because of his reputation as a literalist. He shows great enthusiasm for the literal sense, and his biographers are quick to point this out. He is often represented as a Biblical literalist who served future generations by overthrowing allegory. Wyclif indeed praises the literal sense. He likewise condemns any use of allegory that might blunt the truth of Scripture for reasons of self-interest. He denounces

the hierarchy's use of allegory to smooth over the sharp rebuke of the Bible. He is certain that the words of Jesus mean simply what they say. No misunderstanding attaches to the plain moral commandments of the Gospels. It is essential that those commandments remain uncompromised. They are the core of the Bible's authority, and the Bible itself can nowhere else contradict them. Indeed the commandments of Jesus are the guide by which allegory may correctly interpret passages in the rest of Scripture. Wyclif as a literalist accepted the sayings of Jesus as a standard for all allegorical interpretation. The literal reading is therefore necessary for the truth of the allegorical. Wyclif did not really contradict himself by his use of both.⁴⁵

If Wyclif's attitude is nevertheless somewhat ambiguous, the reason lies in a two-fold desire on his part—a double aim dictated by the needs of the Church. The literal sense bluntly opposed corrupt practices. No self-indulgent monk or prelate could withstand the picture of Jesus in his poverty. No roadside friar telling fables could deny that the Sermon on the Mount was the genuine teaching of Christ. The literal sense of the Gospels indicted them. Yet, Wyclif's heritage was one in which the relevance of the whole Bible had been maintained by the use of allegory. No other technique of interpretation offered a plausible method for finding Christian truth in all the canonical books. Failure to use allegory meant seriously damaging the usefulness of the Bible as a final authority. Its place would have to be shared with any number of other codes and special rules. Indeed other codes were already in use. They were the canon law and the rules of the religious orders. Wyclif saw in the special orders a denial of the unity of Christ and a growing indifference toward Scripture. The one rule of living contained in God's Law was less and less effective among the many orders. Throughout his works Wyclif recorded his opposition to the "sects"—the monks, the friars, the prelates, the Pope.⁴⁶ His language was exaggerated and bitter but not devoid of reason. He was convinced that the Church is always in danger of its own specialized disciplines and techniques should any one of these usurp the place of the Bible at the center of the ministry. Only the Bible may govern Christians. He therefore denounced the complexity and the weakness of an established and sprawling church organization. To restore the Church to unity and simplicity Wyclif put forward the Bible. To preserve the unity of the Bible itself he necessarily retained the heritage of the orthodox pastor, the heritage of instruction by allegory.

1. W. W. Shirley, ed., *Fasciculi Zisani-
orum Magistri Johannis Wyclif Cum
Tritico*—ascribed to Thomas Netter of
Walden (London: Longman, Brown,
Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1858),
in the *Rolls Series*, Vol. V, p. xli.
2. Margaret Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible
and Other Medieval Biblical Versions*
(Cambridge: at the University Press,
1920), pp. 249-251, 370-373, and *passim*.
3. K. B. McFarlane, *John Wycliffe and
the Beginnings of English Nonconformity*
(London: English Universities
Press, 1952), pp. 12-13.
4. "... quod ista est vera de virtute
sermonis secundum quamlibet eius
partem..." *De Veritate Sacrae Scrip-
turae*, ed. by R. Buddensieg (London:
for the Wyclif Society by Truebner
and Company, 1905-1907), I, c. 1, p. 2.
5. "... tum quia in illa consistit salus
fidelium, tum quia illa est fundamentum
cuicunque opinioni catholice, sed et
exemplar est et speculum ad examinan-
dum et extingendum quemcunque erro-
rem sive hereticam pravitatem." *De
Veritate*, I, c. 1, p. 1.
6. *De Veritate*, I, 6, pp. 128-143, and
passim.
7. Cf. *De Benedicta Incarnacione*, ed. by
H. Harris (1886), c. 1, pp. 4, 18; *De
Civili Dominio*, ed. by R. L. Poole and
I. Loserth (1885-1904), I, 399, 402,
437, II, 153; *Officio Regis*, ed. by
A. W. Pollard and C. Sayle (1887)
III, 115. Cf. H. B. Workman, *John
Wyclif* (Oxford: at the Clarendon
Press, 1926), p. 149.
8. Cf. *De Veritate*, *passim*, especially I,
c. 2, pp. 35-39.
9. "Si ... ratio contra divinarum scrip-
turarum, auctoritatem redditur, quan-
tumcunque acuta sit, fallit verisimi-
litudine, nam vera esse non potest." *De
Veritate*, I, c. 3, p. 62.
10. "Nec est putandum, quod iste sanctus
doctor adulatorie sit mentitus, vel quod
solum intelligat de scriptura, que est
codex factus de pellibus animalium
mortuorum." *De Veritate*, I, c. 2, p. 22.
11. For example, in *Contra Epistolam Mani-
chaei vocant Fundamenti*, c. 5, par. 6.
12. *De Veritate*, I, c. 9, pp. 194-205. Wyclif
acknowledges the helpfulness of inter-
pretations by the Fathers, but this
is very different in his thinking from
accepting the interpretation of the
hierarchy.
13. *De Doctrina Christiana*, I, c. 35-36, par.
39-40.
14. Thomas Netter, *Doctrinale Antiquitatum
Fidei Ecclesiae Catholicae* (Ed. by F. B.
Blancioti; Venice, 1757), I, c. 34,
p. 186. Cf. Workman, *Wyclif*, p. 119.
15. *De Veritate*, I, c. 2, p. 38.
16. *De Veritate*, I, c. 2, p. 39.
17. "cum autem in scriptura sacra sit
omnis veritas, patet, quod omnis dis-
putacio, omnis terminorum significacio
vel sermocinialis sciencia, que in scrip-
tura sacra non habet originem, est
prophana." *De Veritate*, I, c. 6, p. 138.
18. *De Veritate*, I, c. 2, p. 22.
19. "in hos siquidem puto me esse certum,
quod non est philosophicum negare
creacionem mundi cum omnibus partibus
suis vel increatam trinitatem cum
ydeis et aliis veritatibus eterna." *De
Veritate*, c. 2, p. 31.
20. "et ista philosophia naturalis est utilis
pro intellectu scripture." *De Veritate*,
I, c. 5, p. 96.
21. *Sermones*, ed. by I. Loserth, (1887-
1890), III, 29, ser. iv.
22. *De Doctrina Christiana*, II, c. 16, par.
24.
23. Cf. Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the
Bible in the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed.
(Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952), p. 14,
where she says, "To write a history
of Origenist influence on the west
would be tantamount to writing a
history of Western exegesis."
24. *Confessiones*, VI, c. 4.
25. Cf. *De Doctrina Christiana*, *passim*, but
especially II, c. 10 to end.
26. Cassiodorus Senator, *Institutiones*, ed.
by R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: at the
Clarendon Press, 1937). The two parts
are entitled "Liber Primus, Divinarum
Litterarum" and "Liber Secundus
Saecularium Litterarum."
27. Cf. P. C. Spieq, *Esquisse d'une
Histoire de l'Exégèse Latine au Moyen
Age* (Paris: Librairie Philosophique
J. Vrin, 1944), p. 26. Also, Smalley,
Bible, pp. 37-39.
28. Cf. F. L. Battle, "Hugh of Saint-
Victor as a Moral Allegorist," *Church
History*, XVIII, 4 (December, 1949),
220-240. Also Smalley, *Bible*, pp. 83-
106.
29. Hugh of St. Victor, *Opera Omnia*
(Venetiis: Apud Nicolaum Pezzana,
1732), Tomi Octo. Roger Bacon, *Opus
Majus*, trans. by R. B. Burke (Phila-
delphia: University of Pennsylvania
Press, 1928), 2 vols., especially I, 36-
115, "Philosophy" and the "Study
of Tongues." Robert Grosseteste,
Bishop of Lincoln, *Epistolae*, ed. by
H. R. Luard (London: Longman, Green,
Longman, and Roberts, 1861), in the
Rolls Series, Vol. XXV, especially
Letter CXXIII, pp. 346-347. Cf.
Smalley, *Bible*, pp. 175, 268-270,
276-277, 294, 317. Also Spieq, *Esquisse*,
pp. 181-187, 191-192.
30. *De Veritate*, I, c. 2, p. 22.
31. R. B. Tollinton, trans., *Selections from
the Commentaries and Homilies of
Origen* (London: Society for Promot-
ing Christian Knowledge, 1929), pp.
xvi-xxix.
32. *Expositio in Librum Beati Job*, I, c.
15, par. 21.

33. "... leo significat secundum rudes gramaticos bestiam quadrupedem rugitivum, sed secundum theologos significat preterea nunc Cristum, nunc diabolum, ut ostendit Gregorius..." *De Veritate*, I, c. 1, p. 15.
34. Smalley, *Bible*, p. 197.
35. Maurice de Sully, *French Homilies from a Sens Cathedral Chapter MS*, ed. by C. A. Robson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952).
36. *De Veritate*, I, c. 3, p. 41; I, c. 4, p. 77; I, c. 9, p. 202; III, c. 28, p. 125.
37. Cf. the so-called English works of Wyclif, e. g., *Select English Works*, ed. by Thomas Arnold (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1869-1871), I, 170-171, ser. lvi.
38. "et ideo ut sententia Dei sit planior et servus suus inutilis excusabilior, videtur quod in illo ocio quo a scolasticis ociatur et in particulari edificacioni ecclesie in fine dierum nostrorum sollicitamur, sint sermones rudes ad populum colligendi, ut si qui sane doctrine Christi consenserint plus notentur, et qui a veritate catholica declinaverint declinentur." *Sermones*, I, Praefatio.
39. *Sermones*, III, 62-69, ser. ix on Isaiah 60.
40. *Sermones*, III, 125, ser. xvi. *English Works*, II, 277-278, ser. xix.
41. "... certum tractatum ad declarandum logicam sacre scripture compilare." *De Logica*, ed. by H. Dziewicki (1893), p. 1.
42. Cf. G. G. Coulton, *Chaucer and His England* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1957), pp. 3-5.
43. *The Significance of the Lollard Bible* (University of London: the Athlone Press, 1951), pp. 8-9.
44. *De Civili Dominio*, ed. by R. L. Poole and I. Loserth (1885-1904), 4 vols. Cf. Workman, *Wyclif*, II, chapter 2.
45. Truth underlies the literal meaning: "ecce, quante sancti doctores laborarunt ad excusandum scripturam sacram a falsitate, ipsi enim nescierunt, quod aliquis sit sensus scripture literalis verbalis, qui sit impossibilis." *De Veritate*, I, c. 4, p. 73. See his discussion of the senses, *De Veritate*, I, c. 6, pp. 119-124, where he indicates that literal and allegorical senses should coincide. He seems to say that the catholic meaning is the literal sense when that meaning is immediately derivable from scripture. If the meaning is mediate, one of the other three senses is in use. In any case, they all agree. Twisting by allegory: "et sic posset proterviens totum sensum scripture subvertere negando sensum literalem et fingendo sensum figurativum ad libitum, ut recitat in libro suo De Heresibus: quomodo quidam heretici dixerunt, totam scripturam intelligi ad sensum mysticum et non ad literam, et Manichei dixerunt e contra, quod tota theologia mistica intelligi debet ad literam, ut patet epist. nona Ad Ieronimum." *De Veritate*, I, c. 2, p. 36; cf. Introduction, p. xxxv.
46. Cf. e. g., *Sermones*, III, 25, ser. iv; 230-239, ser. xxix; 273-274, ser. xxxiii. *English Works*, II, 226-227, ser. ii; 254, ser. xi.

MAJOR VOLUMES AND SELECTED PERIODICAL LITERATURE IN LUTHER STUDIES, 1956-1959¹

JOHN DILLENBERGER, *Drew University*

Bibliographical Surveys and Aids

In the last years, a number of surveys on Luther have appeared. Some of these will be continued. With the re-appearance of the *Luther-Jahrbuch* and the regular "Zeitschriftenschau" by Günther Franz in various issues of the *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, an ongoing medium for references to articles and reviews of books is at hand. All major German books are reviewed in the *Luther-Jahrbuch* and in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*. The 1957 issue of the *Luther-Jahrbuch*, the first volume in the resumed series after a fifteen year interval, contains a summary Luther-Bibliography for 1940-1953, and a more extensive survey for the year 1954. The 1958 volume contains a bibliography for 1955; the 1959 one, for 1956; the 1960 one, for 1957. The disadvantage of the time lag in publication does provide the possibility of a comprehensive listing. Apart from the book reviews, the materials are listed without evaluation.

A very helpful overall interpretative picture of Luther research stems from the reports prepared for the first International Congress for Luther research held at Aarhus, Denmark, in August 1956. Some of the reports were first published in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for 1956, but the complete list—some in expanded form—appeared in the volume on the Congress, *Lutherforschung Heute* (Berlin, 1958), edited by Vilmos Vajta. The surveys include: Thestrup Pedersen on Scandinavia, Valdo Vinay on Italy, George Forell on the United States, Gordon Rupp on England, Walther von Loewenich on Germany, Theobald Suss on France, and Deszö Wiczian on Hungary. Given 1956 as the date of the Congress, the articles are naturally limited to materials which appeared prior to that date. Roland Bainton has given a report on the Aarhus Conference in the volume, *Luther Today* (Luther College Press, Decorah, Iowa, 1957). Reflections on the Congress are also provided by Ragnar Bring, "Lutherforschung heute, Reflexionen über den Lutherforschungskongress in Aarhus 1956," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1959, 161ff.). To this list may be added the articles by Hans Storck, "Die schwedische Lutherforschung in den letzten drei Jahrzehnten" in *Luther: Mitteilungen der Luther Gesellschaft* (1957,

1. For the period, 1950-1955, see *Church History* (1956, 160ff.). Where significant material for the year 1955 was omitted in the previous survey, it has been included in this one, and in instances where a controversy has extended into 1960, the relevant reference to literature in 1960 is included.

75ff.) and Richard Stauffer, "La théologie de Luther d'après les recherches récentes," *Revue de théologie et philosophie* (1957, 7ff.). The articles by Storck and Stauffer do not go beyond the year 1955. A very comprehensive bibliographical review of the Reformation, including Luther, for the period 1945-1955, is to be found in the two-part article by Walther Peter Fuchs, "Forschungen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte des Reformationszeitalters," *Welt als Geschichte* (1956, 124ff., 218ff.). David Lofgren has written an extensive review of recent important books in an article "Verschiedene Tendenzen in der neuern Lutherforschung," *Kerygma und Dogma* (1956, 146ff.).

For libraries and scholars generally, it is important that Karl Schottenloher's six-volume *Bibliographie zur deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung 1517-1585*, which was practically sold out upon its completion in 1940, is being republished in Stuttgart by Anton Hiersemann. Important and exceedingly helpful too, in spite of some notable omissions, is *Bibliographie de la Réforme, 1450-1648* (Leiden, 1958). It includes works covering the above mentioned period published in Germany and the Netherlands between 1940 and 1955. Additional volumes will cover other countries as well.

Most helpful and time saving is Kurt Aland's *Hilfsbuch zum Luther-Studium*, prepared with the help of Ernst Otto Reichert and Gerhard Jordan (Berlin, 1957). Luther's writings are listed alphabetically and chronologically, and most important, the precise places are indicated where Luther's works are to be found in various editions. Useful too, though not intended for scholarly use, is Aland's *Lutherlexikon* (Berlin, 1956). This is particularly true in the continued absence of an index for the Weimar edition. The volume has 1700 citations from Luther listed under 800 categories, with the exact reference to the Weimar edition. Included too is a listing of the contents of each volume of the Weimar edition. More extensive, less usable and not always trustworthy, but in English, is the three-volume anthology, *What Luther Says* (St. Louis, 1959), compiled by Ewald M. Plass at the request of the Committee for Scholarly Research of the Missouri Synod Lutherans. It has many short quotations on 200 subjects.

In the last year, a number of "Festschriften" have appeared, either fully or in part on Luther. Since they will be referred to in this survey on the basis of individual essays, they are simply listed here. Not mentioned in the last survey is *Gedenkschrift für D. Werner Elert* (Berlin, 1955). Others are *Solange es "Heute" heisst; Festgabe für Rudolf Hermann zum 70. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1957); *Festgabe*

Joseph Lortz, (I, Baden-Baden, 1958); *Dank an Paul Althaus. Eine Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag* (Gütersloh, 1958). The 1958 edition of the *Luther-Jahrbuch* is also dedicated to Paul Althaus.

The *Martin Luther Lectures* for the centennial celebration of Luther College, Decorah, Iowa, have been published in three volumes. Since here, too, reference will be made to individual lectures, the volumes are simply listed here: *Luther Today* (Decorah, Iowa, 1957); *More About Luther* (Decorah, Iowa, 1958); and *The Mature Luther* (Decorah, Iowa, 1959).

Editions of Luther's Works

For English readers, major interest centers in the continued publication leading to the 55 volume edition of *Luther's Works* (Concordia and Muhlenberg). Since the over-all literature to be covered in this survey is so vast and the individual volumes of *Luther's Works* have been extensively reviewed, the original intent to comment extensively on the volumes has been abandoned. Only minor issues have been raised about any of the volumes, and the series has generally held its solid competent level. At the moment of writing (August 1960), fourteen volumes have appeared, plus the companion volume, *Introduction to the Exegetical Writings*, by one of the editors, Jaroslav Pelikan. Of the exegetical writings (volumes 1-30), volume 1 of the eight volumes containing the lectures on Genesis has appeared: *Lectures on Genesis Chapters 1-5* (St. Louis, 1958). Although there are selections from Genesis in the not too reliable and unobtainable Lenker edition and a more recent abbreviated two-volume edition of Genesis (Zondervan, 1958), translated by J. Theodore Mueller, this will be the first full scale English translation and publication of the lectures on Genesis. Moreover, the critical problem of early editorial revision of Luther's lectures in order to make them conform to the emerging Lutheranism is taken into account. The much less extensive *Lectures on Deuteronomy* have appeared this year (1960) as volume 9, and have heretofore not been available in English. While the early lectures on Psalms have not appeared as yet (volumes 10-11), three volumes entitled *Selected Psalms* (volumes 12-14) are available. These commentaries, unlike the early lectures, represent Luther at a time when his Reformation faith was full-blown. Except for two groups of Psalms in volume 13 (the commentaries on Psalms 1 and 2 and the Penitential Psalms), these commentaries come out of special occasions and situations, not directly or even indirectly from the lectures either of 1513 or of 1518. They span at least two decades of Luther's mature career. Volume 21, as the first volume containing New Testament materials, has a brief introductory essay covering the difference between Luther's Old and New Testa-

ment writings. The materials from Luther include sermons on Matthew, put together as the *Sermon on the Mount*, and the commentary composed on the *Magnificat*. Volumes 22 and 23 are *Sermons on the Gospel of St. John*, covering the first 8 chapters with the exception of chapter 5. An additional volume will appear on St. John. The usually considered decisive commentaries on Romans and Galatians are still to appear.

Of four volumes covering the *Career of the Reformer* (31, 32, 33, 34), all but volume 33 have appeared. They cover significant documents having to do with Luther's response to events, which frequently led him to thorough theological exposition variously expressed in more or less polemical vein. Of four volumes on *Word and Sacrament* (35-38), the first two volumes are ready. The first contains writings of sacramental significance largely around the year 1519, materials centered in the nature and authority of the Word, and Biblical prefaces. The second is confined to writings on the Mass and the Lord's Supper between the years 1520-1526. Volume 40 of the three on *Church and Ministry* (39-41) has appeared, as has also the first of the two volumes on *Luther's Sermons* (51-52). It not only includes sermons covering both the span of Luther's preaching career and the great variety of subject matter, but also an immensely helpful if brief introduction to the extent and nature of Luther's preaching and his sermons.

Two further volumes have appeared in the Weimar edition, volumes 10/i and 10/ii of *Die deutsche Bibel*. Primarily they contain Job, the Psalter of 1531 and 1545, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes. But in addition to these two volumes, progress toward the completion of the series can be reported. Most of the assignments have been made and the work is under way, though in some instances the attendant problems of research will take years to complete. *Die deutsche Bibel* will need to be brought to completion, the *Briefe*, including an index; volume 55, *Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen*, which is growing in size; an adequate and much needed index to the *Schriften*, volumes 1-57 (the current index volume 58 has been declared unacceptable because its categories are inadequate in the light of the development of Luther research); and the new edition of the first lectures on Psalms, which are even more necessary with respect to an adequate documentation of sources than to corrections in the text. There are plans for a photochemical reproduction of the entire Weimar edition, with plans too for special publications of corrections which can be obtained also by those having the older unobtainable edition. While neither the time of adequate scholars nor the money needed for a new edition can readily be found when the original edition is not complete, the above

proposal will, however, make the complete edition generally available, including obvious corrections and certain new materials. All the problems of the edition are fully discussed by Rückert, "Die Weimar Lutherausgabe: Stand, Aufgaben und Problemen" in *Lutherforschung Heute* (Berlin, 1958) and an account of the edition is also given by Erwin Mülhaupt, "Wissenswertes von der Weimarer Lutherausgabe," *Luther. Mitteilungen der Luther Gesellschaft* (1956, 28ff.). For a supplemental account on the relation of earlier editions, see Reinhold Jauernig, "Die Konkurrenz der Jenaer mit der Wittenberger Ausgabe von Martin Luthers Werken," *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1959, 75ff.).

Erwin Mülhaupt, in *D. Martin Luthers Psalmen-Auslegung*, I., Psalmen 1-25 (Göttingen, 1959), has begun a series modelled after his previously published "Evangelienauslegung Luthers." Mülhaupt has made a selection from what Luther had to say about those Psalms in his lectures, sermons, exegetical writings, table-talk, prefaces, letters, hymns, etc. When used with care and a due regard for the setting of the materials, these volumes may well be as useful as Mülhaupt's previous work on the Gospels. Mention should also be made here of the small volume, *Das schöne Confitemini* (Neukirchen Kreis Moers, 1957, Heft 18, *Biblische Studien*), Luther's exposition of his favorite Psalm 118, which he wrote as he was engaged at the Wartburg in translating the Prophets into German.

Martin Luther, *Oeuvres* (I, Geneva, 1957; VIII, Geneva, 1959) is a much needed French edition which will come to ten volumes. It is published under the auspices of the Lutheran church in France, and the review *Positions Luthériennes*. Also, a single volume of Luther's writings has appeared in Italian, *Martin Lutero. Scritti Religiosi* (1958), edited by G. Miegge and V. Vinay. Volume II of the *Reformation Writings of Martin Luther, The Spirit of the Protestant Reformation*, edited by Bertram Lee Woolf, published in England by Lutterworth and in the United States by Philosophical Library, appeared in 1956.

Two volumes of single works are not only available again, but available in revised and fresh translation: *The Bondage of the Will*, (Westwood, N.J., and London, 1957), translated by J. I. Packer and O. R. Johnston, and the 1531 lectures on Galatians, in a revised translation by Philip S. Watson—*A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (Westwood, N.J. and London, 1953, reissued 1956). *Luther's Commentary on Genesis* (Grand Rapids, 1958), has appeared in an abridged form, in two volumes, translated by J. Theodore Mueller. As in the case of his translation of Luther's lectures on Romans, neither the principle of selection nor the technicalities of in-

dicating abridgements have been made clear or convincing. But it will be very useful short of the appearance of the full translation.

Two volumes, infinitely better than most devotional materials, are to be noted: *Devotions and Prayers of Martin Luther* (Grand Rapids, 1956), selected and translated by Andrew Koster, and *Prayers of the Reformers* (Philadelphia, 1958), compiled by Clyde Manschreck. A volume of Luther's sermons, first translated and published three-quarters of a century ago, has been revised by V. E. Beck and republished—*Sermons on the Passion of Christ* (Rock Island, Illinois, 1956).

On Martin Luther

Four substantial volumes have appeared on Martin Luther generally. Robert Herndon Fife, in *The Revolt of Martin Luther* (N.Y., 1957), painstakingly records the life of Luther in its total social setting through the Diet of Worms. The book is noted for its thorough delineation of the total scene, rather than for its theological acumen. But precisely in this respect, it is most helpful, even though some of the materials and the bibliography show no signs of awareness of Luther research in recent years. Apparently the manuscript was in near final form long before it was published. Ida Walz Blayney, in *The Age of Luther. The Spirit of Renaissance—Humanism and the Reformation* (N.Y., 1957), provides us with a survey of the Renaissance in the first third of the book. The rest of the volume is given primarily to Luther, and covers the social scene and Luther's theological ideas with equal ease. There is a good deal of quotation from Luther, particularly in translation from the Erlangen edition. As in the case of Fife, there is no evidence of acquaintance with recent Luther research, and for that matter, reference to literature other than Luther is indeed sparse. But in both instances, professors of German literature and not professional historians of theology have made substantial contributions to the literature on Luther. Albert Hyma's volume, *New Light on Martin Luther, with an Authentic Account of the Luther Film of 1953* (Grand Rapids, 1958), is a refreshing book. As a single book on Luther, it would hardly give one a good over-all picture. Its power lies in the myths and misinterpretations which it explodes, always with a good deal of documentation. It is a supplemental book.

Franz Lau's *Luther* (Berlin, 1959, Sammlung Götschen, Bd. 1187) is a comparatively short volume, but compact, pointed, and solid. It is an historical study of Luther's work in a series of essays whose rubrics are actually systematic and schematic. Here is a book written out of an intimate knowledge of Luther and of Luther research, with judicious judgments.

An excellent over-all article on Luther by E. Wolf is to be found in *Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon* II (Göttingen, 1958, 116ff.). A pleasant book for browsing is Oskan Thulin's *Martin Luther. Sein Leben in Bildern und Zeit-Dokumenten* (Berlin, 1958). In addition to delineating Luther's life through documents from Luther's writings and those of others, about half of the volume consists of pictures of Luther, his contemporaries, caricatures, churches, and places. An attractive book of drawings and commentary is also provided by Heinrich Dittmar, *Martinus Luther. Sein Leben in Bildern* (Stuttgart, 1957). Roland Bainton has published an interesting, if not too earth-shaking a lecture, "Luther on Birds, Dogs, and Babies," *Luther Today* (Decorah, Iowa, 1957). See also the charming little popular volume by Fritz Blanke, *Luthers Humor* (Hamburg, 1957). *Martin Luther als Kind, Vater, und Freund* (Berlin, 1957) is a posthumous volume of Georg Buchwald, connecting passages of Luther in a continuous text.

The lectures by Theodore C. Tappert, "Luther in his Academic Role," and by William J. Kooiman, "Luther's Later Years," both in *The Mature Luther* (Decorah, Iowa, 1959), are significant and informative.

Luther is dealt with in the context of popular superstition in the chapter by Gottfried Holtz, "Luther und der Volksaberglaube," *Solange es "Heute" Heisst* (Berlin, 1957). The question of whether Luther is to be regarded in a more conservative or revolutionary sense is discussed in two articles: Walther von Loewenich, "Reformation oder Revolution?", *Festgabe Joseph Lortz* I (Baden-Baden, 1958), and Franz Lau, "Luther-Revolutionär oder Reaktionär?," *Luther. Mitteilungen*. . . (1957, 109ff.). Albert Greiner in *Luther. Essai Biographique* (Geneva, 1956), sponsored by "Labor et Fides," has written a popular biography, the first for use in France since the last century, partly as a forerunner to the publication of Luther, *Oeuvres*. The illustrations by d'Etienne Lovy are superb. The book by Ricardo V. Feliu, *Lutero en España y América Española* (N.Y., printed in Spain, 1956) is intended as an over-all unbiased account of Luther for Spain and Spanish-speaking Americans. But the author's Roman Catholic views interfere with his success. (See the review by John E. Longhurst, *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* [1957, 275ff.].)

The volume by Walter J. Tillmanns, *The World and Men Around Luther* (Minneapolis, 1959), consists of a series of composite sketches covering political and social events, predecessors, Renaissance figures, Reformers, printers, painters, martyrs, etc. The short sketches are woven into a running account. The volume adds nothing new and is a convenient reference for the unimportant.

The following is a listing of popular volumes: Merle W. Boyer, *Luther in Protestantism Today* (N.Y., 1958); Harry Emerson Fosdick, *Martin Luther* (N.Y., 1956), a Landmark Book; Theodore J. Kleinhaus, *Martin Luther. Saint and Sinner* (St. Louis, 1956); Hermann Schuster, *Martin Luther Heute. Zeitbedingtes und Bleibendes* (Stuttgart, 1958); R. G. Short, *Meet Martin Luther* (Grand Rapids, 1959), which includes extensive quotations from Luther.

Historical Interpretation

Since Professor Dowey has covered the general history of the Reformation in his bibliographical article (*Church History*, June, 1960), the reader is referred to his work. Consequently only a few general histories will be recalled here. First may be mentioned *The New Cambridge Modern History*, II, *The Reformation* (Cambridge, 1958), edited by G. R. Elton. It is comprehensive, highly useful, contains excellent sections by Rupp and Bizer, but on the whole is not as excellent as one would have anticipated. A most sensitive and discerning general history is that by Hajo Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany, I, The Reformation* (N.Y., 1959). Will Durant's Part VI in "The Story of Civilization," is largely centered in the Reformation. It is entitled *The Reformation. A History of European Civilization from Wyclif to Calvin: 1300-1564* (N.Y., 1957). Unfortunately Durant's understanding of theological issues and theological history is dated and frequently downright inaccurate. Comprehensive in its coverage but not comprehensive in relating all aspects to each other is Erich Hassinger's *Das Werden des neuzeitlichen Europa, 1300-1600* (Braunschweig, 1958), which is volume I of "Geschichte der Neuzeit," edited by Gerhard Ritter. The volume further contains an excellent bibliography of 86 pages. I have seen but have not been able carefully to examine the volume by Hellmuth Rössler, *Europa im Zeitalter von Renaissance, Reformation und Gegenreformation 1450-1650* (Munich, 1956).

A number of events in Luther's career have received historical and interpretative attention. Siegfried Asche deals with Erfurt and Luther's stay there in a little volume—*Luther in Erfurt* (Berlin, 1957, Heft 31 of "Das Christliche Denkmal"). See also the article by Franz Lau, "Luthers Eintritt ins Erfurter Augustinerkloster," *Luther. Mitteilungen* . . . (1956, 49ff.). J. M. Lenhart, in "Commentary. Luther and Tetzel's Preaching of Indulgences, 1516-1518," *Franciscan Studies* (1958, 82ff.), contends that Catholic and Protestant historians have alike left the impression that Tetzel taught a wrong view of indulgences when, instead, he taught a view of their efficacy which was officially considered valid. In *Martin Luthers Thesenanschlag und dessen Vorgeschichte* (Weimar, 1959), Hans Volz may well have

written the definitive volume on a number of knotty historical problems. He convincingly shows, it seems to the present writer, that the nailing of the theses occurred on November 1, not October 31. Volz has also written on the latter issue in *Deutsches Pfarrerblatt* (1957, 457ff.). See also the article by Konrad Algermussen, "An welchem Tag schlug Luther seine Thesen an?", *Catholica* (1958, 75ff.). For some time, E. Bizer and H. Volz have been debating problems surrounding the Schmalkald articles. The literature in question is primarily the following. E. Bizer "Zum geschichtlichen Verständnis von Luthers Schmalkaldischen Artikeln," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (1955-6, 61ff.), which makes references to Volz; also "Die Wittenberger Theologen und das Konzil 1537. Ein ungedrucktes Gutachten," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* (1956, 77ff.); H. Volz, "Luthers schmalkaldische Artikel," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (1957, 259ff.), and E. Bizer, "Noch einmal: Die schmalkaldischen Artikel," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (1957, 287ff.). The scholarly debate in part centers in the alleged intrigue by Melancthon, whether the Elector wanted to put the articles out as a confessional statement, and whether the articles have their origin in independence of the council question. H. Volz, with the help of Heinrich Ulbrich, has in any case provided us with a volume dealing with the sources in connection with the articles—*Urkunden und Aktenstücke zur Geschichte von Martin Luthers schmalkaldischen Artikeln (1536-1574)* (Berlin, 1957, Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, no. 179).

On the early sources for Luther's thought, attention should be given to the following: P. Courcelle, "Luther interprète des Confessions de Saint Augustin," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* (1959, 235ff.), in which Luther's dependence on the Confessions of Augustine is indicated. More significant is Horst Beintker's article, "Neues Material über die Beziehungen Luthers zum mittelalterlichen Augustinismus," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (1957, 144ff.). The thesis is that Luther's early sources focus on Peter d'Ailly as much as Occam, and that among d'Ailly's sources is Gregory of Rimini. The textual comparisons behind the thesis are L. Saint-Blancat, "La théologie de Gregoire de Rimini et les sources de la théologie luthérienne primitive" (in an unpublished testimonial volume) and "La théologie de Luther et un nouveau plagiat du Pierre d'Ailly," *Positions Luthériennes* (1956, 61ff.). As background material for reading Luther, see also E. Iserloh, *Gnade und Eucharist in der philosophischen Theologie des Wilhelm von Ockham. Ihre Bedeutung für die Ursachen der Reformation* (Wiesbaden, 1956).

A number of additional excellent articles on specific matters may be noted: Ludwig Petry, "Die Reformation als Epoche der deutschen

Universitätsgeschichte," in *Festgabe Joseph Lortz*, I, (Baden-Baden, 1958); Ernest G. Schwiebert, "New Groups and Ideas at the University of Wittenberg," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* (1958, 60ff.); Harvey Buchanan, "Luther and the Turks, 1519-1529," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* (1956, 145ff.); Rudolf Pfister, "Reformation, Türken und Islam," *Zwingliana* (1956, 345ff.); Robert Stupperich, "Die Reformatoren und das Tridentinum," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* (1956, 20ff.); H. von Campenhausen, "Die Bilderfrage in der Reformation," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (1957, 96ff.); Bernhard Lohse, "Luthers Antwort in Worms," *Luther. Mitteilungen*. . . (1958, 124ff.); Erwin Mülhaupt, "Vergängliches und Unvergängliches an Luthers Papstkritik," *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1959, 56ff.).

There is a chapter on Luther in the excellent volume by E. Harris Harbison, *The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation* (N.Y., 1956).

Two popular histories of the Reformation are the following: the Catholic Philip Hughes, *A Popular History of the Reformation* (N.Y., 1957; New revised Image Book, 1960); the Protestant William Stevenson, *The Story of the Reformation* (Richmond, 1959). Considerable attention is given to Luther in the popular volume, Erwin Mülhaupt, *Reformatoren als Erzieher* (Neukirchen Kreis Moers, 1956, Band 4, "Zeugen und Zeugnisse").

Dating Luther's Breakthrough and the Nature of Justification

Luther's fundamental religious breakthrough, known as his tower experience and having to do with a drastically fresh understanding of Romans 1:17, for some time has been placed in Luther's early lectures on the Psalms, as early as 1513. In the preface to the Latin edition of his works in 1545, Luther indicated that he came to a new view of Romans 1:17 in 1519 and consequently then began to understand the Psalms better the second time through. Ficker, Loofs, and Holl regarded Luther's recollection at this later date as wrong, and in this they have generally been followed. Boehmer, Holl, O. Ritschl, R. Seeberg, Rupp believe the new understanding is to be found in the first lecture on Psalms. E. Hirsch placed it at Psalms 30/31, and Vogelsang at Psalms 71/72. In spite of questions concerning this dating raised by Alex Gyllenkrok in *Rechtfertigung und Heiligung in der frühen evangelischen Theologie Luthers* (Uppsala and Wiesbaden, 1952) and by Uuras Saarnivaara in *Luther Discovers the Gospel: New Light upon Luther's Way from Medieval Catholicism to Evangelical Faith* (Finnish ed., 1947; St. Louis, 1951), the earlier dating has prevailed. More recently it has been challenged indirectly in Carl Stange's pamphlet, *Die Anfänge der Theologie Luthers* (Berlin, 1957).

Stange convincingly shows that the new understanding of Romans 1:17 is not to be found in the first lectures on the Psalms, but interprets the new interpretation of Romans 1:17, not as the beginning of Luther's decisive theology, but as the decisive breakthrough to opposition to the Papacy. But a strictly theological understanding of Romans 1:17 has led two interpreters to date the tower experience in the year 1518. Evidently, each independently came to his understanding in the academic year 1955/56. Ernst Bizer in *Fides ex auditu, Eine Untersuchung über die Entdeckung der Gerechtigkeit Gottes durch Martin Luther* (Neukirchen Kreis Moers, 1958) carefully expounds and analyzes the major writings and events, and comes to the conclusion that the decisive breakthrough is first evident in the "Proceedings at Augsburg" (*Acta Augustana*), though there are previous questions and intimations in that direction. It is next most evident in two sermons on righteousness. F. Edward Cranz in *An Essay on the Development of Luther's Thought on Justice, Law, and Society* (Harvard Theological Studies, XIX, Cambridge, 1959) almost accidentally and timidly enters upon this question. Interested in the broad social context, as the title indicates, he discovered that the sources would not bear the earlier interpretation and he thus sets out in the early part of his volume to indicate the understanding of justice and justification in Luther's writings. While he sees some development in the period from 1513-1518, he does not see any significant breakthrough. Righteousness is still a partial righteousness which the believer possesses and which will be completed, however much it is considered a gift. In 1518-1519 occurs a decisive change, in which the believer now is considered totally righteous before God, even while in the eyes of the world he is still sinner. The full theological implications of this change are not always drawn until considerably later.

A suggestive account of the Luther interpreters on the question of the righteousness of God, together with an analysis of the crucial texts, has been given by Gerhard Pfeiffer in "Das Ringen des jungen Luther um die Gerechtigkeit Gottes," *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1959, 25ff.). While Pfeiffer is sympathetic to an earlier dating than Bizer is, though without finally committing himself, it is evident to the reader of both that the crucial issue is differently interpreted by Pfeiffer and by Bizer. While the problem cannot be resolved on that level, it is apparent that the theological understanding with which one comes does make a difference. If the crucial issue is that the righteousness of God is not a demand to be feared but rather is a gift which effectively operates in man for his redemption, then justice, righteousness, justification so understood are already present in the earliest lectures on the Psalms. But that understanding, however graphically

and freshly put by Luther, essentially belongs to the best of the evangelical tradition within the Middle Ages. But if justice, justification, righteousness have reference to the mercy of God whereby we are given the total status of righteousness in the present, where faith and righteousness are equated in this passive sense even as man in point of fact before the world remains sinner, one has an understanding which decisively breaks with the best of the medieval tradition, and for that matter, with much of the subsequent Protestant development. From this focal point, not from the other, Luther discovered the freedom of the Gospel and the freedom for the world. And that understanding, it seems to me, whether or not identical with the tower experience, comes essentially from the period where Bizer and Cranz have placed it, even though one must assume a development in the midst of which a decisive break occurred.

Bizer, as a sequel to *Fides ex Auditu* and partially in opposition to Stange, has also written *Luther und der Papst (Theologische Existenz Heute, Heft 69, Munich, 1958)*. Here he shows that the opposition to the Papacy grew as a theological sequel to the understanding of Romans 1:17. The essential position taken by Bizer in the first named book is generally supported by the Roman Catholic Hubert Jedin in an article on "Luthers Turmerlebnis in neuer Sicht. Bericht über Ernst Bizer, *Fides ex Auditu*" (*Catholica*, 12, 1959, 129ff.), but he cannot help reminding us that Grisar already assumed the late date. Lowell C. Green in a section entitled, "The Young and the Mature Luther," *The Mature Luther* (Decorah, Iowa, 1959), takes a position, held also by others, that there was a religious awakening in the years 1513-14, which is identical with the tower experience, and a theological discovery, dated 1518-19. The basic point may be correct; but the particular dating of the tower experience does not thereby follow. Hans Pohlmann, in *Hat Luther Paulus entdeckt? Eine Frage zur theologischen Besinnung* (Berlin, 1959, Studien der Luther-Akademie, Neue Folge, Heft 7), a study in which not only the question of whether Luther discovers Paul's meaning but also when and where, contends that the subsequent development is already visible in aspects of the first lectures on Psalms; that the tower experience, having to do with the meaning of the righteousness of God, comes in the Romans lectures of 1516 and is a new understanding of the monk Luther but not necessarily anti-Catholic; that the decisive Reformation breakthrough comes in 1519 (Leipzig debate) and is first fully evident in the writings of 1520. Bizer, Stange, and Pohlmann, in spite of their differences, see the decisive Reformation break in 1519.

Articles on various aspects of faith, justification, and its implications include the following: Paul Althaus, "Liebe und Heilsgewissheit

bei Martin Luther," *Festschrift Joseph Lortz*, I, (Baden-Baden, 1958) and "Das Wort Gottes und der Glaube bei Martin Luther," *Una Sancta* (1959, 142ff.); Walter Matthias, "Imputative und sanative Rechtfertigung. Systematische Erwägungen zu Luthers Rechtfertigungslehre," *Libertas Christiana, Friedrich Delekat zum 65. Geburtstag* (Munich, 1957); W. M. Oesch, "Luther on Faith," *Concordia Theological Monthly* (1956, 184ff.); Lennart Pinomaa, "Die Heiligen in Luthers Frühtheologie," *Studia Theologica* (1959, 1ff.); Robert D. Preus, "The Significance of Luther's Term 'Pure Passive' as quoted in Article III of the Formula of Concord," *Concordia Theological Monthly* (1959, 243ff.); Gustaf Wingren, "Justification by Faith in Protestant Thought," *Scottish Journal of Theology* (1956, 347ff.); Lennart Pinomaa, "Die profectio bei Luther," *Gedenkschrift für D. Werner Elert* (Berlin, 1955).

Theological Expositions

Ekkehard Börsch, in the volume *Geber-Gabe-Aufgabe. Luthers Prophetie in den Entscheidungsjahren seiner Reformation 1520-1525* (Munich, 1958, Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus, zehnte Reihe, Band XIII), has provided us with an overall view of Luther's theology in the years under consideration. It appears that the mode of thinking of Karl Barth is used to expound Luther, and it works surprisingly well. Citations from Luther abound, and although Luther does not think in Barth's categories, the substance of their thought is the same. But it is apparent again that Barth is a more reliable historian than his disciples, who do historical work in the light of his theological presuppositions. Moreover, while there are extensive quotations from Luther, no reference is made to Luther research since 1953, even though more recent literature is listed in the bibliographies. Apparently the manuscript was written a long time prior to its publication.

J. Bakker's . . . *Coram Deo; Bijdrage tot het onderzoek naar de structuur van Luthers Theologie* (Kampen, 1956) is likewise an overall theological exposition of Luther's thought. Utilizing the concept *coram deo* as a fruitful key to the structure of Luther's thought, he ranges through a good deal of Luther's theology insofar as it bears on man's position before God. Carefully done, the book is also comparatively free of theological bias. The author has one interest, expounding Luther's thought and its problems. (While I have examined the Dutch, I have read only the extensive German summary appended to the volume and apparently supplied by the author.)

A number of volumes, while not devoted entirely to Luther, do provide expositions which range over nearly the entire compass of Luther's theology. T. F. Torrance's "The Eschatology of Faith," in

his volume *Church and Kingdom* (London, 1956), is a scholarly essay, written from a perspective which frequently provides fresh nuances between the lines. The chapter by Jaroslav Pelikan, "The Goodness of God," in *Fools for Christ* (Muhlenberg, 1955; *Human Culture and the Holy*, London, 1959) is a substantial though popular essay. Walther von Loewenich in *Von Augustin zu Luther. Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte* (Witten, 1959) has a dozen essays on Luther ranging over a wide circle of problems, for example, Pharaoh, freedom, church, state, Catholic interpretation of Luther, piety, Luther research.

The place of law in Luther's thought is explored in a number of volumes: Gerhard Heintze, *Luthers Predigt von Gesetz und Evangelium* (Munich, 1958); Aarne Siirala, *Gottes Gebot bei Martin Luther. Eine Untersuchung der Theologie Luthers unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des ersten Hauptstückes im grossen Katechismus* (Helsinki, 1956; Stuttgart, Schriften der Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft 11); Lauri Haikola's two volumes, *Studien zu Luther und zum Luthertum* and *Usus Legis* (Uppsala and Wiesbaden, 1958, respectively Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1958:2 and 1958:3). Central to Heintze's interpretation is that law and Gospel are one, and that we are to understand law in the light of Gospel. Knowledge of sins comes from the Gospel, not from the law. Certainly it is clear that Luther's sermons do not distinguish as much between law and Gospel as do his other writings. One cannot help surmising, however, that this otherwise thorough volume suffers from the same defect as does that of Börsch, that is, reading Luther too much through the eyes of Barth's theology. Luther is not adequately understood through either the traditional or Barthian eyes.

Aarne Siirala gives much more attention to law as the carrier of God's relation to the world, though he does not separate law and Gospel. Much attention is given to the significance of the First Commandment. The place of law in relation to creation and to a general theocentric, rather than a Christocentric interpretation, is maintained, though without diminishing grace. In this sense, the book stands in contrast to that of Heintze. Moreover, the book is a kind of summary of Luther's theology inasmuch as law is related to all aspects of Luther's thought.

In both of the books by Haikola, Luther and Lutheranism are contrasted in careful studies covering anthropology, sin, faith and justification, and of course law, including the third use of the law. Quite rightly he sees a different spirit in Luther than in the more doctrinaire developments in Lutheranism. Both volumes are significant historical studies. Rudolf Hermann's pamphlet, *Zum Streit um*

die Überwindung des Gesetzes (Weimar, 1958), is a study of Luther in relation to Agricola and the antinomian controversy. The need for law is seen to be a part of Luther's thought on every level, but in a safeguarded manner.

Hellmut Bandt's *Luthers Lehre vom verborgenen Gott. Eine Untersuchung zu dem offenbarungsgeschichtlichen Ansatz seiner Theologie* (Berlin, 1958, Theologische Arbeiten, Band VIII) is a thorough-going study of the hiddenness of God. Since the book is written in the tradition of Barth, it is therefore all the more surprising that at many points the theological understanding is not as sharp or imaginative as one would expect. David Löfgren is right in pointing to a very crucial problem, Bandt's apparent misunderstanding of the hiding of God in His revealing, because of an intellectualist concept of faith.

Bernhard Lohse, in *Ratio und Fides. Eine Untersuchung über die Ratio in der Theologie Luthers* (Göttingen, 1958, Forschungen zur Kirchen und Dogmengeschichte, Band 8) is a thorough study of reason in Luther's thought, covering the historical development and providing the context for understanding both the deprecatory and appreciative aspects of Luther's utterances. It is undoubtedly the best over-all book on this subject. On the relation of faith and reason, attention should also be called to Bengt Hägglund's article "Was Luther a Nominalist?", a reprint which appeared in *Concordia Theological Monthly* (1957, 441ff.). The philosophical question is also touched on in the article by Ulrich Mann, "Ethisches und Ontisches in Luthers Theologie," *Kerygma und Dogma* (1957, 171), with the accent falling on the ethical.

Two noteworthy articles have appeared on predestination: L. Pinomaa, "Unfreier Wille und Prädestination bei Luther," *Theologische Zeitschrift* (1957, 339ff.), and Wolfhart Pannenberg, "Der Einfluss der Anfechtungserfahrung auf den Prädestinationsbegriff Luthers," *Kerygma und Dogma* (1957, 109ff.). The latter has all the earmarks of being definitive.

Additional materials bearing on theology include the following: Klaus Burba, a small volume, entitled *Die Christologie in Luthers Liedern* (Gütersloh, 1956, Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte Nr. 175); Peter Meinhold, a small volume, *Luthers Sprachphilosophie* (Berlin, 1958); Th. Suss, "Non a summo, sed ab imo. Versuch einer Deutung der theologischen Methode des Reformators," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1957, 731ff.); P. Althaus, "Die Reformation als Bekenntnis zu Jesus Christus," *Luther. Mitteilungen*. . . (1956, 97ff.), "Luthers Wort vom Ende und Ziel des Menschen," *Luther. Mitteilungen*. . . (1957, 97ff.); G. Rupp, "World

and Spirit in the First Years of the Reformation," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* (1958, 13ff.); Horst Beintker, "Phase Domini. zu Luthers Interpretation des metanoia," *Solange es "Heute" heisst* (Berlin, 1957); R. H. Esnault, "Le 'De votis monasticis' de Martin Luther," *Etudes Théologiques et Religieuses* (1956, 19ff., I, Introduction; 58ff., II, Les vœux et la liberté évangélique); Hayo Gerdes, "Zu Luthers Lehre vom Wirken des Geistes," *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1958, 42ff.).

Biblical

Undoubtedly the most thorough and comprehensive book on Luther's hermeneutical method since Ebeling's *Evangelische Evangelienauslegung* (1942) is Jaroslav Pelikan's companion volume to *Luther's Works, Luther the Expositor. Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings* (St. Louis, 1959). In the first part of the volume, Luther's exegetical procedure is examined with reference to a number of problems, and in each instance, Luther's way of approaching the issue emerges in the discussion. In the second part of the volume, Luther's way of exegesis is illumined by the exploration of various Biblical passages on the Lord's Supper. One matter emerges unambiguously in this study—the exegetical and Biblically grounded nature of all of Luther's theology, however one may differ with him in interpretation. Moreover, the passages on the Lord's Supper lend themselves to a good study of Luther's exegetical work. But inadvertently, they tend to set Luther squarely into the setting of the Lutheran debates. While he belongs here, the absence of other case studies—as for example, on justification—unintentionally distorts. But one cannot ask for everything in an exceptional volume such as this one.

Another volume dealing with Luther's approach to Scripture is H. Ostergaard-Nielsen, *Scripture sacra et viva vox. Eine Lutherstudie*, (Munich, 1957, *Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus*, Zehnte Reihe, Band X). Against the formal authority of Scripture, attested to by Occam and Erasmus, stands the vital, living content, revealed through historical categories. The stress falls upon the lively Word, found in Scripture but not identical with the written Scripture. Particularly helpful in this volume is the contrast which is continually drawn and delineated between the approach of Erasmus and that of Luther. The latter problem of Luther and Erasmus has been carefully delineated with reference to Luther's views on the clarity of Scripture in the *Bondage of the Will* in Rudolf Hermann's book, *Von der Klarheit der Heiligen Schrift. Untersuchungen und Erörterungen über Luthers Lehre von der Schrift in*

De servo arbitrio (Berlin, 1958, Gotteswort und Menschenwort in der Bibel).

Warren A. Quanbeck provides a careful analysis of the nature of Luther's early biblical work, together with some historical allusions to Luther's sources, in his lectures, "Luther's Early Exegesis," *Luther Today* (Decorah, Iowa, 1957).

Kurt Aland has given a good summary of Luther's approach to Scripture in an article "Luther as Exegete," *Expository Times* (1957, 45ff., 68ff.). A scholarly and perceptive account is to be found in the article by B. A. Gerrish, "Biblical Authority and the Continental Reformation," *Scottish Journal of Theology* (1957, 337ff.).

A full length study of Luther's exposition of Ecclesiastes is provided by Eberhard Wölfel, *Luther und die Skepsis. Eine Studie zur Kohelet-Exegese Luthers* (Munich, 1958, Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus, zehnte Reihe, Band XII). It provides an interesting clue to Luther's biblical interpretation. On the one hand, every attempt is made to take the reflections and questions concerning human life seriously. On the other hand, Luther overcomes them in the light of a Christological interpretation which makes it a Christian book.

Additional articles include: Heinz Bluhm, "Luther and the First Printed English Bible: Epistle to the Galatians," *Anglican Theological Review* (1958, 264ff.), a scholarly account; L. W. Spitz, Jr., "Luther Expounds the Gospels," *Concordia Theological Monthly* (1957, 15ff.), a safe, general account; Hans Volz, "Luthers Arbeit am lateinischen Psalter," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* (1957, 11ff.) and "Luthers Stellung zu den Apokryphen des alten Testaments," *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1959, 93ff.), both documented and historically important.

The Church and Sacraments

The question of the dating of the emergence of reformation ideas is apparent also in the interpretation of Luther's conception of the Church. Gordon Rupp in "Luther and the Doctrine of the Church," *Scottish Journal of Theology* (1956, 384ff.) agrees with Karl Holl in that the main elements of Luther's doctrine of the Church are to be found already in the first lectures on the Psalms, that the doctrine of the Church antedated the church struggle in the years 1517-21. Obviously, Rupp believes that the church struggle affected and clarified the previously held conceptions. Holsten Fagerberg in "Die Kirche in Luthers Psalmen Vorlesungen, 1513-1515," *Gedenkschrift für D. Werner Elert* (Berlin, 1955), contends, against Holl, that the Catholic tradition informs these lectures even though there are ideas present which are influential for all of Luther's life.

Ernst Kinder, in "Die Verborgtheit der Kirche nach Luther," *Festgabe Joseph Lortz*, I, (Baden-Baden, 1958), as provided us with an excellent analysis of hiddenness and invisibility with reference to the Church. Fundamentally, these concepts have to do with the recognition and nature of the true Church in relation to the visible Church, apart from which empirical Church the concepts are not valid or applicable. The correlation to Luther's *deus absconditus* is apparent.

Max Lackmann, in "Thesaurus Sanctorum. Ein vergessener Beitrag Luthers zur Hagiologie," *Festgabe Joseph Lortz*, I (Baden-Baden, 1958), has challenged Bonhoeffer's interpretation of the young Luther with reference to the concept of the *communio sanctorum*, particularly the Catholic notion of *Thesaurus*. Cyril Eastwood, in "Luther's Conception of the Church," *Scottish Journal of Theology* (1958, 22ff.), takes issue with Bishop Newbigin's general position that the Reformers and the reformed tradition did not sufficiently emphasize either the organic unity or historical continuity of the Church.

The volume by Leon Chestov, *Sola Fide. Luther et l'Église* (Paris, 1957, translated from the Russian by Sophie Sève, *Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses publiées sous les auspices de la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de l'Université de Strasbourg*, collection dirigée par R. Mehl), stems primarily from a manuscript left at the author's death. There is nothing on Luther research prior to 1910 and it is more interesting as Chestov than as Luther.

The following lectures and articles on the Church are noted: Herman A. Preus, "The Christian and the Church," *More About Luther* (Decorah, Iowa, 1958); Wilhelm Maurer, "Was verstand Luther unter der Reformation der Kirche?", *Luther. Mitteilungen*. . . (1956, 49ff.); Ulrich Seeger, "Luthers Kampf für die wahre Kirche Christi in seiner Schrift 'Wider Hans Worst'," *Luther. Mitteilungen*. . . (1956, 106ff.); Kurt Dietrich Schmidt, "Luthers Ansatz zur Neuordnung der Gemeinden im Jahre 1523," *Luther. Mitteilungen*. . . (1958, 14ff.).

Hermann Sasse, in *This is My Body; Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar* (Minneapolis, 1959), has given extensive attention to the events leading to the Marburg Colloquy, the Colloquy itself, and its aftermath. There is a vigorous defense of the real presence, both for Luther and in the author's own thinking, not so much with reference to the question of how, that is, the philosophical question, as to its Biblical assertion. The author, for instance, objects to the term "consubstantiation" as a philosophical conception. There is no question but that for Sasse, Luther's view of the Sacrament was the crucial fight concerning the meaning

of the Gospel. An extensive and well-documented treatment of the Lord's Supper is Carl Fr. Wisloff's *Nattverd og Messe* (Oslo, 1957). It includes sections on the words of institution, works, merit, sacrifice, real presence, liturgy, etc.

The meaning of the "real presence" continues to be debated. In the last decade, the issue in German research has been joined particularly by Peter Brunner and Ernst Bizer. Generally, it may be said that Brunner goes so far as to stress the presence of Christ's death as the genuine happening of salvation in the Lord's Supper. Bizer sees this as a new teaching, reminiscent of certain teachers of the early Church, but not correct either for Luther or the Lutheran Confessions. Bizer tends to emphasize more the "pointing" nature of the sacrament, particularly in Luther's early works. In interpreting the more objective understanding of the sacrament after 1520, Bizer still does not see Brunner's position in Luther. Peter Brunner is inclined toward a particular and normative reading of the Lutheran Confessions, which also becomes determinative for interpreting Luther. Two writings of E. Bizer are mentioned here: "Lutherische Abendmahlslehre?", *Evangelische Theologie* (1956, 1ff.), and "Die Entdeckung des Sacraments durch Luther," *Evangelische Theologie* (1957, 64ff.). A survey of the problem, including reference to all the literature, together with a viewpoint safeguarding both the promise in the setting of faith and the real presence, is provided by Ernst Kinder, "'Realpräsenz' und 'Repräsentation'. Feststellungen zu Luthers Abendmahlslehre," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1959, 881ff.).

On the Lord's Supper, see also Regin Prenter's lecture, "The Lord's Supper," *More About Luther* (Decorah, Iowa, 1958), and R. Peuchmaurd, "La Messe est-elle pour Luther une action de Grace?", *Revue des Sciences philosophiques et Théologiques* (1959, 632ff.).

In addition to a lecture by Regin Prenter, "Holy Baptism," *More About Luther* (Decorah, Iowa, 1958), a unique book is to be noted on baptism—Karl Brinkel, *Die Lehre von der fides infantium bei der Kindertaufe* (Berlin, 1958, Theologische Arbeiten, Band VII). This is a documented and careful analysis from the sources. Brinkel defends Luther's concept of "infant faith" as following from a strict analysis of faith as a gift which God works. If that aspect of faith is stressed, the voluntaristic and conscious aspects of faith dare not become prominent in discussing the *nature* and *foundation* of faith. The author further relates his problem both to Luther research generally and to the totality of Luther's thought.

Two significant volumes have appeared on Luther's conception of discipline in the Church. Ruth Götze in *Wie Luther Kirchenzucht*

übte. *Eine kritische Untersuchung von Luthers Bannsprüchen und ihrer exegetischen Grundlegung aus der Sicht unserer Zeit* (Berlin, 1959, Theologische Arbeiten, Band IX) delineates Luther's own practise and use of excommunication. The sources are documents of various types, primarily letters and the table-talk. The second—and earlier—volume, by Hans-Werner Gensichen, is more comprehensive—*Damnamus. Die Verwerfung von Irrlehre bei Luther und im Luthertum des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1955, Arbeiten zur Geschichte und Theologie des Luthertums, Band I). It is an examination and delineation of the criteria for distinguishing between true and false teachings in Luther and in early Lutheranism, and the way in which wrong teachings are to be met. It is written out of an ecumenical concern for the issue in the churches today and with a positive evaluation of Luther.

Other aspects of the Church are covered in the following lectures and articles: Jaroslav J. Pelikan, "Luther and the Liturgy," *More About Luther* (Decorah, Iowa, 1958); Wilhelm Niesel, "Wie verhielten sich die Reformatoren zur biblischen Lehre vom Gottesdienst?", *Evangelische Theologie* (1956, 534ff.); Hans Hartog, "Die Privatbeichte und die Schlüsselgewalt in der Theologie der Reformatoren," *Monatschrift für Pastoraltheologie* (1957, 360ff.); Klaus Tüchel, "Luthers Auffassung vom geistlichen Amt," *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1958, 61ff.); Wilhelm Brunotte, "Das geistliche Amt bei Luther als ordinatio Dei," *Luther. Mitteilungen*. . . (1959, 24ff.); Harold J. Grimm, "The Human Element in Luther's Sermons," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* (1958, 50ff.); J. Heckel, "Die zwei Kirchen," in *Im Irrgarten der Zwei-Reiche-Lehre* (Munich, 1957, Theologische Existenz Heute m. 55). See also the helpful volume by Herbert Girgensohn, *Teaching Luther's Catechism* (Philadelphia, 1959, trs. by John W. Doberstein from the German edition, *Katechismus-Auslegung*, Witten, 1956).

Roman Catholics and Luther²

For nearly two decades, Roman Catholic scholarship on Luther has exhibited a new responsible phase, concerned with the scholarly issues. The center of that movement is Joseph Lortz. It is therefore fitting that the new spirit is dramatically celebrated in the two-volume *Festgabe Joseph Lortz* (Baden-Baden, 1958), the first volume of which centers primarily in the Reformation and is the joint product of Catholic and Protestant scholars. The older viewpoint, however, is pressed again in a responsible Franciscan journal by Reinhold Weijenborg in two articles. The first, written in Latin, is "Miraculum

2. Generally, Roman Catholic writers are included with others under the subject rubrics. In this section attention is given only to issues in which it appears that a type of Roman Catholic position particularly affects the scholarly interpretation of Luther.

a Martino Luthero confictum explicatne eius reformationem?", *Antonianum* (XXXI, 1956, 247ff.), and the second, "Neuendekte Dokumente im Zusammenhang mit Luthers Romreise," *Antonianum* (XXXII, 1957, 147ff.). According to the first article, Luther faked the matter of the thunderstorm in order to be taken into the monastery more readily and in order to secure the approval of his father. Then he stayed in order to escape the inquisition and consequently inaugurated new teachings which would save him from having to face this slander of God. With respect to the new documents, some of them were unknown before, and while it is good to have them, they do not bear the negative interpretation which Weijenborg gives to Luther's journey to Rome. It is particularly gratifying to have these articles exposed by the Roman Catholic, Erwin Iserloh, in his article, "Luther-Kritik oder Luther-Polemik? Zu einer neuen Deutung der Entwicklung Luthers zum Reformator" in volume I of the Lortz Festschrift. Weijenborg is taken more seriously as a learned scholar, with a wrong viewpoint, by Franz Lau, who apparently is convinced that we shall hear much more from Weijenborg about Luther. Lau's article is "Père Reinoud und Luther. Bemerkungen zu Reinhold Weijenborgs Lutherstudien," *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1960, 64ff.). Lau also calls attention to another article by Weijenborg, "Un caso tipico di esegesi esistenzialista presso Lutero," *Protestantesimo di ieri e di oggi* (Rome, 1958, 66ff.), in which Luther is interpreted as seeing himself and his father analogously to Jacob and Laban in Genesis 31. An additional negative judgment on Weijenborg comes from Theobald Suss, "A Propos de l'Entrée de Luther au Couvent," *Positions Luthériennes* (1957, 284ff.). See also *Protestantismo* (1958, 60ff.).

Psychological

In contrast to the older psychological interpretations undertaken by Roman Catholic writers or the doctrinaire views of such men as P. I. Reiter,³ there is a new trend of sympathetic psychological analysis. The views of Reiter, that Luther suffered from an endogenous cyclophrenia, are effectively challenged by a theologian and physician, Eberhard Grossmann, in a pamphlet, *Beiträge zur psychologischen Analyse der Reformatoren Luther und Calvin* (Basel, 1958). Grossmann believes that Luther was a cyclothymic personality, with great variations in moods which affected his private life but which left his works largely untouched. Erwin Mülhaupt, in "Luthers Kampf mit der Krankheit," *Luther. Mitteilungen der Luther Gesellschaft* (1958, 115ff.), has certainly shown that in spite of repeat-

3. P. I. Reiter, *Martin Luther Umwelt, Charakter und Psychose* (Copenhagen, 1937 and 1947). The general theme of Reiter is followed through in less extreme form by Martin Werner in an article which first appeared in 1948, "Psychologisches zum Klostererlebnis Martin Luthers," and which has been republished in *Glaube und Aberglaube* (Bern/Stuttgart, 1957).

ed illnesses of a usually incapacitating character, Luther was more productive than normal men. Reiter, too, as well as a good number of others, are considered doctrinaire Luther interpreters by Erik H. Erikson, in *Young Man Luther. A Study in Psychoanalysis and History* (Norton, New York, 1958). Erikson himself has given a sympathetic, but nonetheless full-blown psychological interpretation of Luther running from his childhood through the year 1527, the year of the Reformer's alleged greatest melancholia. Luther, according to Erikson, had an acute "identity" crisis, precipitated and conditioned by his fear and hatred of his father, and yet he had an incapacity to cut off the relation drastically. This hatred was transferred to God, to the Papacy, and thus explains the form of much of Luther's religious problem. Moreover, in typical psychological form, when Luther became what his father wanted him to be, the deepest despair emerged. There is much in this book which is fresh, suggestive, and occasionally historically significant when least important. But the central thesis is most in doubt. The book is not written without a good deal of material from and concerning Luther. But where the information stops or is scanty, we are left with the "clinician's" filling in and exercising his judgment.

Much more helpful for shedding light on Luther than Erikson, is a more consistent and traditional Freudian interpretation by Norman O. Brown in a chapter in his book, *Life Against Death. The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History* (Wesleyan University Press, Middletown, Connecticut, 1959). Indignant that Protestants and lately Catholics as well have shied away from acknowledging that the "tower experience" of Luther actually took place in the privy of the tower, Brown insists that it is psychologically significant that "the religious experience which inaugurated Protestant theology took place in the privy" (p. 203). This, I think, he does not establish. But he does shed light on Luther's language with reference to the Devil and everything which exemplifies the Devil by an analysis of the relation between anality and the Devil. Through historical analysis and extensive quotation from Luther, it is clear that Luther stands in and graphically exemplifies a psycho-sociological tradition which is illuminating for a fuller historical and theological understanding of Luther. Moreover, what Brown has to say about Luther's strictures on capitalism provides a theoretical understanding (even if not necessarily an acceptable one) which is a good antidote to those who view Luther's statements on the economic level as simply sporadic and reactionary. Nevertheless, it is regrettable that the discredited Grisar, rather than recent scholarship, should be the secondary authority for Brown.

The Two Realms and some Ethical Questions

The problem of the two realms in Luther's thought has been debated for a long time. But it has been debated with new vigor since the jurist Johannes Heckel published *Lex Charitatis. Eine juristische Untersuchung über das Recht in der Theologie Martin Luther* (Munich, 1953). Although this book deals in wider compass than the matter of the two realms, many of the issues, in the light of Heckel's views, have focused here. It may be noted in passing that Heckel finds a Christological grounding to Luther's views on law and right, precisely what Barth has not found in Luther. Hardly an article has appeared since which does not react in one way or another to this book. Since it would be redundant to summarize the contents of each one, a general word may be said about the problem and reference made only to distinctive features of some of the articles. In the light of Luther research, it is obvious that the two realms, while distinguishable, cannot be separated as if God were not positively related to both and as if every man were not responsible in and for both. Part of the general difficulties arise, however, from a number of factors. First, subsequent Lutheran history on the two realms is not only easily read back into Luther, but Luther is blamed for that history. Second, the terms realms, regiment, *obrigkeit*, can hardly be understood in Luther's sense. Third, the context in which Luther was working and in which he made the distinctions was a very special historical situation, certainly not comparable to much of subsequent history.

Of the earlier comments on J. Heckel, mention is here made of only one—E. Wolf, "Der christliche Glaube und das Recht," *Zeitschrift für evangelisches Kirchenrecht* (1955, 225ff.), which is essentially favorable. It should be noted too that the volume by Gunnar Hillerdal, *Gehorsam gegen Gott und Menschen* (1955), entered the critical debate, with Heckel himself responding; see Heckel's "Luthers Lehre von den zwei Regimenten," *Zeitschrift für evangelisches Kirchenrecht* (1955, 253ff.).

Paul Althaus has written an extended comment on Heckel in "Die beiden Regimente bei Luther. Bemerkungen zu Johannes Heckels 'Lex Charitatis,'" *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1956, 129ff.). He believes that Heckel confuses "world" or "worldly" with "worldly regiment," that he is generally too negative in his view of this realm because he under-estimates its positive theological grounding quite apart from sin, and understands it too much as the realm of Satan. In the following year, he wrote "Luthers Lehre von den beiden Reichen im Feuer der Kritik," *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1957, 40ff.), in which the worldly realm is defended as ordained of God out of love, even apart

from human sin. Barth, Thielicke, R. Niebuhr, and J. Heckel come under critical review. Authority is rightly defined as more extensive than the State, but generally speaking, Luther is defended at all costs. But Althaus is instructive in stressing that Luther needs to be understood in a conception of general community in which it is agreed that rulers are to be responsible and subjects trusting. The notion of a citizenry which has responsibilities of a political kind along with rulers had not yet arisen, declares Althaus. From a slightly different perspective, and with more deference, Franz Lau raises questions in "Leges Charitatis. Drei Frage an J. Heckel," *Kerygma und Dogma* (1956, 76ff.). J. Heckel has responded to Althaus in his "Im Irrgarten der zwei-Reiche-Lehre" (Munich, 1957, *Theologische Existenz Heute*, No. 55). Extensive comment on Heckel is to be found in the article by T. Suss, "Le droit dans la théologie de Luther," *Positions Luthériennes* (1958, 34ff.).

Hans Robert Gerstenkorn, in *Weltlich Regiment zwischen Gottesreich und Teufelsmacht. Die staats-theoretischen Auffassungen Martin Luthers und ihre politische Bedeutung* (Bonn, 1956, Schriften zur Rechtslehre und Politik, Band 7), contends that the realms of God and of the devil are not identical with the two realms, but rather run through both, particularly the worldly realm. The realms are themselves God's weapons against Satan. Authority, too, which is not identical with the State, is conceived in personal terms—kings, princes, etc. Further, both the power of Satan and eschatological dimensions generally need to figure more prominently in the understanding of the two realms. H. H. Schrey, in "Luthers Lehre von den zwei Reichen und ihre Bedeutung für die Weltanschauungssituation der Gegenwart," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1956, 369ff.), develops Luther's thoughts on the realms along the analogy of the Chalcedonian formula and of the notion of complementarity in order to avoid both separation and a mixture of the two. Gottfried Forck, in "Die Königsherrschaft Christi und das Handeln des Christen in den weltlichen Ordnungen nach Luther," *Kerygma und Dogma* (1957, 23ff.), develops the notion that the two realms are both under the Lordship of Christ and that consequently the Christian has responsibility in both. In book length form, originally a thesis at the University of Heidelberg, Forck has developed his thesis with care and thoroughness—*Die Königsherrschaft Jesu Christi bei Luther* (Berlin, 1959). The most comprehensive and judicious article on the two realms, written in the light of the debate, seems to me to be that by Heinrich Bornkamm, "Luthers Lehre von den zwei Reichen im Zusammenhang seiner Theologie," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* (1958, 26ff. Also printed separately, Gütersloh, 1958). A good deal

of discerning and scholarly attention is also given to the issue by T. F. Torrance in the chapter, "The Eschatology of Faith: Martin Luther," in *Kingdom and Church. A Study in the Theology of the Reformation* (London, 1956).

The following related articles are noted: Gerhard Gloege, "Politia divina. Die Überwindung des mittelalterlichen Sozialdenkens durch Luthers Lehre von der Obrigkeit," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena* (1956/57, 445ff.); Jürgen Küppers, "Luthers Dreihierarchienlehre als Kritik der mittelalterlichen Gesellschaftsauffassung," *Evangelische Theologie* (1959, 361ff.); Gustav Törnqvall, "Die sozialtheologische Hauptaufgabe der Regimentenlehre," *Evangelische Theologie* (1957, 407ff.); Hans Liermann, "Der unjuristische Luther," *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1957, 69ff.), obviously a corrective to Heckel.

Franz Lau has written two articles on the Peasants' Revolt—"Die prophetische Apokalyptik Thomas Müntzers und Luthers Absage an die Bauernrevolution," *Gedenkschrift für D. Werner Elert* (Berlin, 1955) and "Der Bauernkrieg und das angebliche Ende der lutherischen Reformation als spontane Volksbewegung," *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1959, 109ff.). The essential point in each instance is evident from the title. The problem of participation in war is dealt with by Julius Richter, "Kriegsdienst und Kriegsdienstverweigerung bei Luther," *Luther. Mitteilungen*. . . . (1957, 28ff.). On economics, see Helmut Kahlert, "Luthers und Melanchthons Stellung zu den Wirtschaftsfragen ihrer Zeit," *Luther. Mitteilungen*. . . . (1956, 122ff.). A quite familiar, undocumented, and one would think by now, discredited interpretation is given by Josef Rysan in "Mythological Solution of Crisis. A Parallel between Luther's and Hitler's Germany," *Middle Ages—Reformation Volkskunde. Festschrift for John G. Kuntzmann* (Chapel Hill, 1959, University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literature, no. 26). See also the article by N. Birnbaum, "Luther et le millénarisme," *Archives de Sociologie des Religions* (1958, 101ff.).

Luther and

Luther is inevitably contrasted to other figures in the history of thought. For the most part, such writings are listed here without comment. On Augustine and Luther, there are the following: a pamphlet by A. Nygren, *Augustin und Luther. Zwei Studien über den Sinn der augustiniischen Theologie* (Berlin, 1958); an article by P. Courcelle, "Luther interprète des Confessions de Saint Augustin," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* (1959, 253ff.); and a chapter by Ernst Kinder, "Gottesreich und Weltreich bei Augustin

und bei Luther. Erwägungen zu einer Vergleichung der 'zwei-Reiche' Lehre Augustins und Luther," in *Gedenkschrift für D. Werner Elert* (Berlin, 1955). An article of historical significance is L. Saint-Blancat, "La théologie de Luther et un nouveau plagiat de Pierre d'Ailly," *Positions Luthériennes* (1956, 61ff.). Melancthon and Luther appear as follows: Harold H. Lentz has written a popular and partially special-pleading paper-back edition, entitled *Reformation Crossroads. A Comparison of the Theology of Luther and Melancthon* (Minneapolis, 1958); Lowell C. Green, in his lectures "Luther and Melancthon," *The Mature Luther* (Decorah, Iowa, 1959), relates the history of the relations between the two men and points to the significance of Melancthon's work for Luther's early exegesis. Luther and Calvin are contrasted and their attitude toward each other spelled out by Erwin Mülhaupt in an article of the same title in *Luther. Mitteilungen. . .* (1959, 97ff.). A fully documented and balanced account of Calvin's judgments of Luther as gleaned from the former's correspondence is given by Ernst Zeeden, "Das Bild Martin Luthers in den Briefen Calvins," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* (1958, 177ff.). A popular contrast of the two men, in line with the purpose of the series, is given by Augustine Lemaître, "Calvin et Luther," *Les Cahiers de "Foi et Vérité"* 38, Série 10, No. 2. (Geneva, 1959). Gordon Rupp, in his lectures, "Luther and the Puritans," *Luther Today* (Decorah, Iowa, 1957), has covered Luther's relations to Carlstadt, Müntzer and Zwingli. Other articles in this general category include Hugo Gerdes, "Der Weg des Glaubens bei Müntzer und Luther," *Luther. Mitteilungen. . .* (1955, 152ff.); Heinrich Bornkamm, "Erasmus und Luther," *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1958, 3ff.) and "Faith and Reason in the thought of Erasmus and Luther," *Religion and Culture. Essays in Honor of Paul Tillich* (N.Y., 1959, ed. by Walter Leibrecht); Johannes Heckel, "Marsilius von Padua und Martin Luther," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* (1958, 268ff.); Stephanus Pfürtnner, "Die Heilsgewissheit nach Luther und die Hoffnungsgewissheit nach Thomas von Aquin," *Catholica* (1959, 182ff.); Martin Schmidt, "Spener und Luther," *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1957, 102ff.); and Ernst Wolf, "Asterisci und Obelisci zum Thema: Athanasius und Luther," *Evangelische Theologie* (1958, 481ff.). The latter article is significant for the Christological problem.

Translations of Older Works and Paper-backs

It is particularly good to have the following previously published materials in English translation: Heinrich Bornkamm's *Luthers geistige Welt* (1947), as *Luther's World of Thought* (Concordia,

1958), translated by M. H. Bertram; Karl Holl's essay, *Die Kulturbedeutung der Reformation in Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* (volume I, Tübingen, 1948), the original text of which dates from 1911, but which was revised after 1918, in a paper-back edition, *The Cultural Significance of the Reformation* (Meridian, 1959) translated by Karl and Barbara Hertz and John H. Lichtblau, with a short but significant introductory essay by Wilhelm Pauck; Gustaf Wingren, *Luther on Vocation* (Muhlenberg, 1957) translated by Carl C. Rasmussen; Rudolf Thiel, *Luther* (Muhlenberg, 1955) translated by Guston K. Wiencke; Vilmos Vajta, *Die Theologie des Gottesdienstes bei Luther* (1954) translated as *Luther on Worship* (Philadelphia, 1958), by U. S. Leupold, but regrettably also condensed; Gerhard Ritter's chapter, "Kirche und geistiges Leben in Deutschland um 1517," *Die Neugestaltung Europas* (1950), as "Why the Reformation Occurred in Germany," *Church History* (1958, 99ff.).

In addition to those general books mentioned by Professor Dowey, two formerly published books on Luther now in paper-back editions may be mentioned: Heinrich Boehmer, *Road to Reformation* (Meridian, 1957); T. M. Lindsay, *Luther and the German Reformation* (Zondervan, 1955).

THE WEBER THESIS REEXAMINED*

WINTHROP S. HUDSON, *Colgate-Rochester Divinity School*

For more than fifty years the Weber thesis, which attributed to Calvinism a decisive influence in the development of modern capitalism, has been vigorously debated. In his celebrated essay, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1904), Max Weber had suggested that Calvinism contributed to the rise of capitalism in various ways—by relaxing the restraints which hitherto had largely served to impede its growth; by fostering the economic virtues of diligence, frugality, honesty, prudence, and sobriety; and, most of all, by providing a psychological fillip to the development of the "spirit" of capitalism, "the temper of single-minded concentration upon pecuniary gain." The controversy precipitated by the publication of Weber's essay engendered considerable heat that often served to obscure the points at issue, but over the years the continuing discussion has served to remove many of the issues from the area of debate and to narrow the focus of the central issue that remains.

Weber's initial statement of his thesis was frequently misread, misunderstood, and misinterpreted. Part of the difficulty was a failure to pay sufficient attention to Weber's definition of terms—particularly what he meant by modern capitalism and the spirit of capitalism. Further difficulty was created by those who over-stated the points which Weber was seeking to establish. Even Tawney understood Weber to be asserting that Calvinism, by creating the indispensable psychological climate, was to a very large degree the "parent" of modern capitalism.¹ It is now contended, however, that those who interpreted Weber as saying that modern capitalism was the "offspring" of Calvinism misunderstood him. Weber, it is insisted, never made such a claim and was far too learned and sophisticated to have done so. His intention was much more modest. He was attempting to analyze but one of the many components of the total matrix out of which the capitalist spirit emerged. He did no more than suggest that Calvinism engendered a spirit that was congruent with the spirit of capitalism and thus facilitated the development of capitalist society.² This brings Weber, of course, largely into agreement with Tawney who said that "'the capitalist spirit' is as old as history" and that what certain aspects of later Calvinism did was to provide "a tonic which braced its energies and fortified its already vigorous temper."³

*This paper and the following comment were read at the joint session of the American Society of Church History and the American Historical Association, December 1959, in Chicago.

Whatever Weber may have said or intended, certain general agreements have emerged from the controversy. It is now generally acknowledged that capitalism and the capitalist spirit—even defined as Weber defined these terms—long antedated Calvin's activity at Geneva, that there were other and earlier solvents of those traditional economic attitudes which had served to check the growth of capitalism, and that one of the most significant factors in fostering a capitalist mentality may have been the introduction of double-entry bookkeeping in the fourteenth century.⁴ It is further recognized that the teachings of the Schoolmen had inculcated the "economic virtues" and that these moral theologians of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries had developed a highly rational system of ethics which fostered rational habits of mind and had as its corollary a rational methodizing of life.⁵ There is further agreement that Calvinists often constituted a persecuted minority, were frequently forced to migrate, and in many instances were excluded from the professions and public office. Fanfani has pointed out that most minority groups under such circumstances tend to become industrious and frugal and to participate in commercial activities in disproportionate numbers, and consequently such behavior can scarcely be cited as evidence of the influence upon economic developments of the particular faith they professed.⁶

These agreements, however, do not touch Weber's central concern. Believing as he did that the capitalist spirit was an essentially irrational spirit which ran counter to man's natural human instincts, he concluded that only the most powerful of motivations could make it the dominant spirit of a whole culture. "The magical and religious forces, and the ethical ideas of duty based upon them," he noted, "have in the past always been among the most important formative influences upon conduct."⁷ Might it not be, he asked himself, that this strange irrational spirit, though now unconnected with any religious interest, once had a religious sanction which gave it meaning and support? He had observed what seemed to him to be a remarkable coincidence of a particular religious affiliation with a particular social status—specifically, the identification of Calvinism with the industrial and commercial classes of the centers of capitalistic activity—and he concluded that this might offer a clue to the ceaseless drive of the capitalist spirit. He therefore posed the question: Was this coincidence a mere historical accident or was there some inner organic connection between the spread of Calvinism and the rise of modern capitalism?

Weber proceeded on the assumption that the contrast between the economic conservatism of Roman Catholic and Lutheran lands and the strenuous enterprise of Calvinist communities was not an histor-

ical accident and that it was Calvinism that had welded the feeble thrust of the aspiring *bourgeoisie* into a disciplined force that was able to transform an entire culture and set its stamp on every aspect of society. The feature of Calvinism which he regarded as of crucial significance in this connection was what seemed to him to be the peculiarly Calvinist concept of "the calling."

The central idea to which Weber appeals in confirmation of his theory is explained in the characteristic phrase "a calling." For Luther, as for most medieval theologians, it had normally meant the state of life in which the individual has been set by Heaven, and against which it was impious to rebel. To the Calvinist, . . . the calling is not a condition in which the individual is born, but a strenuous and exacting enterprise to be chosen by himself, and to be pursued with a sense of religious responsibility.⁸

Labor thereby became not simply an economic means but a spiritual end, and ultimately it became an end in itself. The key to this shift, Weber maintained, was the fact that success in one's calling was interpreted as a sign of God's blessing, and thus evidence of one's election. In commercial life success came to be measured more and more in terms of financial profit, and "the pursuit of riches, which once had been feared as the enemy of religion, was now welcomed as its ally."⁹ In the end, this led to an unlimited lust for gain as an end in itself, quite divorced from all moral restraints.

Weber illustrated his thesis with a profuse and wide-ranging selection of examples drawn from history, but he recognized—so Ephraim Fischhoff maintains—that his thesis was inadequately documented historically. Weber's approach to the problem, it is asserted, was not historical but sociological. He was utilizing what has been called "a controlled intuitive method;" and what he did—according to his wife—was to create an "ideal-type" on the basis of "careful causal imputation of intuitively apprehended connections" for purposes of sociological analysis. It was not intended to be a final or dogmatic formulation. It was a "tentative effort," a "preliminary investigation," a hypothesis to be checked and validated. But before Weber undertook the research necessary to validate his thesis, he believed that he must first isolate other components in the total matrix and define them in terms of "ideal types." Then at the end of the process of intuitive analysis, it would be both possible and necessary to return to the historical question "to determine how closely the empirical phenomena approached the ideal types he had formulated."¹⁰

Weber never found time to undertake the historical task of validating his thesis by a detailed study of the actual religious and economic history of specific communities. Thus, from an historian's point of view, he left himself open to the quite valid charge that he sought to demonstrate, for example, the effect of Calvinism on the

economic life of Holland and the Rhineland by utilizing illustrations drawn from Anglo-Saxon writers. It has also been suggested— somewhat facetiously, to be sure—that he raised the question whether or not John Calvin was a Calvinist, for he defined Calvinism largely in terms of the points of view represented by John Wesley and Benjamin Franklin. Furthermore, it has been acknowledged that Weber on occasion fell victim to the temptation to manipulate history in the interest of his thesis.¹¹ Such manipulation, says Tawney, is always “the temptation of one who expounds a new and fruitful idea” and Weber’s essay is “not altogether free” of this defect.¹²

Subsequent research has demonstrated several things with reference to the Weber thesis. First of all, it has been demonstrated that the correlation between the spread of Calvinism and the development of a vigorous capitalist economy was not as uniform as he had supposed. Presbyterian Scotland, for example, witnessed no great surge of economic activity, whereas Roman Catholic Flanders did. Hungary actually declined economically during the most flourishing period of Calvinist activity. Some of the conclusions that have been reached by economic historians as a result of their research have been summarized by Fischhoff as follows:

On the basis of investigations into the history of Holland—and it must be recalled that this republic was probably the first country in which capitalism developed on a large scale—recent Netherlands historians like DeJong, Knappert and de Pater find no proof to sustain such a theory of the connection between Calvinism and capitalism among the Netherlands. Further, Beins’ researches into the economic ethic of the Calvinist church in the Netherlands between 1565 and 1650 lead him to raise serious objections to Weber’s thesis. A similar view is expressed in the important economic history of the Netherlands by Baasch, who stresses the secular factors in the evolution of capitalism in Holland which made the Netherlands the chief bankers of the seventeenth century and by the end of the eighteenth made the colony of Jews in Amsterdam the largest in Europe. The same adverse conclusion is reached by Koch’s investigation of the economic development of the lower Rhine area and Andrew Sayous’ study of the Genevans; Hashagen’s essay on the relation between Calvinism and capitalism in the German Rhineland comes to similar conclusions. Evidence has also accumulated that Calvinism did not have any necessary effect on the rise of capitalism in Hungary, Scotland or France.¹³

These findings, of course, do not disprove Weber’s thesis, for there were many factors involved in each specific situation, but they do raise serious questions and they cannot be construed as providing support for it.

In the second place, Weber’s assumption that for his purposes “ascetic Protestantism” could be treated “as a single whole”¹⁴ has been shown to be false. It has been made abundantly clear, as Tawney has acknowledged, that the economic individualism which Weber

identified in certain aspects of late post-Restoration Puritanism would have "horrified" the earlier Calvinists, including the English Puritans. "No contrast could be more violent," says Tawney, "than that between the iron collectivism, the almost military discipline, the remorseless and violent rigors practiced in Calvin's Geneva, and preached elsewhere, if in a milder form, by his disciples, and the impatient rejection of all traditional restrictions on economic enterprise which was the temper of the English business world after the Civil War." To suggest to "the Puritan of any period in the century between the accession of Elizabeth and the Civil War" that he was a friend of "economic or social license" would have seemed "wildly inappropriate" both to him and to his critics who accused him of being intolerably meticulous.¹⁵ Even Troeltsch admits that a kind of "Christian Socialism" was "contained, from the very outset, in the Genevan ideal of the Holy Community" and that it was continued in the various Calvinist communities "under the cross."¹⁶

The significant question to Tawney is the question as to how the change came about that permitted the free play of the acquisitive spirit within a movement which hitherto had been anti-Mammon in orientation and anti-individualistic in temper.¹⁷ The explanation for such a radical shift, Tawney believed, was not to be found simply in the impact of economic change upon Calvinist thinking. It stemmed, he asserted, from "the very soul of Calvinism" itself.

In reality, the same ingredients were present throughout, but they were mixed in changing proportions, and exposed to different temperatures at different times. Like traits of individual character which are suppressed till the approach of maturity releases them, the tendencies in Puritanism, which were to make it later a potent ally of the movement against the control of economic relations in the name either of social morality or of the public interest, did not reveal themselves till political and economic changes had prepared a congenial environment for their growth.¹⁸

Like Weber, Tawney found the key to the separation of economic from ethical interests in what they both considered "the very heart of Puritan theology"—the Calvinist conception of the "calling."¹⁹ Applied to commercial life, it meant that "poverty . . . was not a misfortune to be pitied and relieved, but a moral failing to be condemned," and that riches were "the blessing which rewards the triumph of energy and will."²⁰ "By a kind of happy, preestablished harmony . . . , success in business is in itself almost a sign of spiritual grace, for it is proof that a man has labored faithfully in his vocation, and that 'God has blessed his trade.'"²¹ The doctrine of the calling was thus the bridge by which, over the course of time, ethical distinctions in commercial life were obliterated and the service of Mammon was identified with service to God.

If more recent research has demonstrated that the correlation of the spread of Calvinism to the development of capitalism was not as uniform as had been supposed and that for its first century and a half Calvinism was far from friendly to economic license, it is now clear that the Calvinist doctrine of the calling has also been misunderstood and misinterpreted. First of all, Robertson disposed of the philological argument which attempted to portray the concept as something utterly new and unique,²² and Fanfani acknowledged that "the idea of vocation, attributed by Weber to the Protestants, was a living idea before the Reformation, and remained alive in the Catholic camp even after."²³ In the second place, it has been made abundantly evident that the concept of a Christian's calling was not an invitation to amass riches but rather it served as a bridle to restrain avarice and ambition. The constant emphasis was upon the danger of riches and the Christian's duty to avoid striving after them. It was precisely the conviction that one's calling was God's gift for which, as a good steward, the Christian must render an accounting that served as a check to covetousness. Far from being a means to accumulate financial gain, one's calling was the normal channel through which love of neighbor was to be expressed and his welfare sought. The Dutch Calvinists were typical in regarding action born of desire for gain as a sign of madness, and in asserting that, while normally one should be diligent in his daily work, excessive labor is to be condemned as robbing time and energy from the many duties that are involved in the service of God.²⁴ In the same way, nothing is more characteristic of Richard Baxter—the most conspicuous figure of post-Restoration Puritanism—than his intensely anti-Mammon temper. He constantly insisted that God and Mammon were antithetical, and he lashed out at the hypocrisy of those who thought that they could be reconciled.²⁵

Among Baxter's contemporaries in late seventeenth century England, there were those, to be sure, who did interpret financial success in one's calling as an indication of divine approval. It should be noted, however, that this transformation of the concept of the calling from a bridle to avarice and ambition into a comfortable doctrine congenial to an uninhibited commercial spirit represented a one hundred and eighty degree shift in interpretation. How are we to account for so marked a change? Certainly, we cannot attribute it to the Calvinist conception of the calling when it was the conception of the calling itself that underwent change. It is quite inconceivable that the Calvinist conception of the calling, as it was understood for almost a century and a half, could have bred a spirit of capitalism, but it is conceivable that the spirit of capitalism could have gradually modified and in the end completely transformed the Calvinist conception of the

calling. And when it was so transformed, it could no longer—in any proper use of terms—be regarded as Calvinistic.

The clue to what occurred is provided by Fanfani in his book *Catholicism, Protestantism, and Capitalism*. Fanfani acknowledges that there were, both before and after the Reformation, many Catholics who “acted in a capitalistic manner” and “introduced a capitalistic mode of life among their Catholic contemporaries.” It would be easy to arrive at the conclusion that capitalism was the “offspring” of Catholicism since “capitalism was born in a Europe that was still wholly Catholic” and “Catholics indisputably fostered its growth.” But Fanfani rightly notes that those Catholics who did act in a capitalistic manner were not “acting in conformity with Catholic social ethics.” Thus the influence they exerted was not because they were Catholics but in spite of their being Catholics.²⁶

Max Weber, Fanfani pointed out, had set for himself a false problem. Weber had assumed that somehow men need to be “called” to devote themselves to riches. “A man does not ‘by nature,’” Weber had said, “wish to earn more and more money, but simply to live as he is accustomed to live and to earn as much as is necessary for that purpose.”²⁷ Troeltsch also had suggested that the seeking of profit as an end in itself was in “opposition to natural human instincts,” although he admitted that there always have been “unscrupulous individuals who are simply out for gain” and who have on occasion “interrupted” the natural order. Such individuals, however, are out of line with “ordinary human instincts.”²⁸ Tawney, to be sure, had acknowledged that the “‘the capitalist spirit’ is as old as history.”²⁹ But he did not base his analysis upon this assumption. “The emergence of the idea that ‘business is business’ . . .,” he insisted, “did not win so painless a triumph as is sometimes suggested.”³⁰ It necessitated a real *tour de force*, for Tawney also believed that basically greed, enterprise, and competition were departures from the “natural state of things.”³¹ Such an assumption, Fanfani asserted, represents a misreading of human nature. As “against Weber,” he said, “we would point out that man has an inborn instinct for gain” and “that external factors either check this instinct or encourage it.”³² How does one explain the establishment of a capitalist spirit in Roman Catholic lands? There were many forces that served to encourage the development of such a spirit, but the major factor which made possible its establishment, Fanfani asserted, was “the waning of faith”—a faith which hitherto had served as a check to the acquisitive spirit.

With the weakening of faith remorse becomes rare; the ‘is’ is no longer compared with the ‘should-be,’ and that which ‘is’ is accepted and exploited in accordance with its own standards. . . .

All the circumstances that, in the Middle Ages, led to a waning of faith explain the progressive establishment of the capitalistic spirit, for the pre-capitalist spirit rests on facts that are not seen, but must be held by faith. Those faithful to it sacrifice a certain result for a result that is guaranteed by faith; they eschew a certain mode of action in the certainty of losing riches, but believing that they will gain a future reward in heaven. Let man lose this belief, and nothing remains for him, rationally speaking, but to act in a capitalistic manner.³³

In reply to Weber, Fanfani would insist that, since the capitalist spirit does not run counter to man's natural human instincts, it is not necessary to posit some strange powerful irrational motivation in order to explain how it could become the dominant spirit of an entire culture.

But what, it may be asked, is the explanation of the "halo of sanctification" that was cast about the "convenient vices" of the business man? Is not the concept of the calling needed to explain this phenomenon? It would seem strange to one who is at all familiar with the Biblical record that this should be considered a problem that needs explanation. The Biblical writings provide abundant illustrations of man's perennial endeavor to hide the nakedness of his self-interest behind a cloak of religious pretensions. Again and again in the Scriptures, we read how men attempted to console themselves with the comfortable assurance that worldly prosperity was an indication of divine favor; and again and again, we find that beguiling assurance exposed as empty and hollow. At this point also the Weber thesis would seem to have posed a false problem as a result of misreading the human story.

Fanfani put forward an alternative theory of the relationship of Protestantism to capitalism. He suggested that the key to this relationship is to be found in the Protestant conception of "the uselessness of works as a means of salvation." The corollary of the idea that "salvation was independent of works," he said, was the "sanctification" of what "is." Thus Protestantism removed any effective restriction upon the free operation of the economic life, and it "encouraged capitalism inasmuch as it denied the relation between earthly action and eternal recompense."³⁴ While it is true that both Luther and Calvin denied that one could earn or merit salvation, no one who has grasped the full structure of their thought would admit that they regarded works as either irrelevant or a matter of indifference. Furthermore, since there is no distinction between Lutheran and Calvinist views at this point, Fanfani's theory will scarcely account for the economic conservatism of Lutheran lands in contrast to the economic progressivism that is said to be characteristic of Calvinist communities. Would it not be more reasonable to suppose that, on the whole, the same relationship existed between Protestantism and capitalism as existed between Roman Catholicism and capitalism, and that in both

instances it was the waning of faith that removed the effective check upon the free play of economic interest?

But what then is to be said of the undoubted coincidence of Calvinism and vigorous economic life in certain centers of western Europe? This is probably to be explained largely in terms of historical accident. "The main explanation," says Fanfani, "must lie with circumstances extraneous to the religious phenomenon."⁸⁵ Calvinism took root on the Atlantic frontier of western Europe at a time when trade, for a variety of reasons, was shifting from the East to the West. It also took place at a time when technical developments had made possible a more complex and large-scale economic life, and at a time when France was beset by internal strife, Spain was in manifest decline, and England and Holland were beginning to enjoy a practical or legal monopoly in most non-European markets.

Calvinism, of course, did inculcate the economic virtues of industry, frugality, honesty, prudence, and sobriety, and this fact is not without significance. Furthermore, Calvinism inculcated these virtues the more effectively because the movement was at the peak of its religious intensity and passion. Given these qualities in the particular situation in which Calvinists found themselves, it was inevitable that they should prosper. And given their particular setting in the commercial centers and their growing prosperity, it is obvious that they occupied a particularly exposed position of peril so far as the integrity of their faith was concerned. Thus their basic convictions were much more subject to the attrition of the world than would have otherwise been true. Moreover, there is always an ebb and flow in tides of spiritual life, and the peculiar circumstances of these particular communities, once the early heroic age of Calvinism was past, contributed to the ebb. The waning of faith then facilitated an adjustment to the claims of commercial enterprise and this resulted in a transformation of the whole mood and temper of these Calvinist groups.

The chief factor in the triumph of the spirit of capitalism would seem to be this: when the faith, which hitherto had served as a check to the acquisitive spirit, became more and more nominal, the adherents of that faith refused to be bound any longer by what they considered to be the antiquated rules imposed by that faith. In other words, a rising class of self-made men found the attraction of a free world of business much greater than that of a waning religious ideal. "Their demand," says Tawney, "was the one which is usual in such circumstances. It was that business affairs should be left to be settled by business men, unhampered by the intrusions of an antiquated morality, or by misconceived arguments of public policy."⁸⁶ A perfect illustration of the adjustment they required is to be found in the publication

of *The New Whole Duty of Man, containing the Faith as well as Practice of a Christian: Made Easy for the Practice of the Present Age* (1744). It was published to replace the first *Whole Duty of Man* (1658), because the earlier volume was not "by any means suited to the present times; for how can it be? it having been written near one hundred years since."³⁷ What was needed was what the subtitle indicated—a conception of duty "made easy for the practice of the present age."

The desired separation of economic activity from ethical restraint, however, was not accomplished without a struggle. As Tawney has observed:

Even in the very capital of European commerce and finance, an embittered controversy was occasioned by the refusal to admit usurers to communion or to confer degrees upon them; it was only after a storm of pamphleteering, in which the theological faculty of the University of Utrecht performed prodigies of zeal and ingenuity, that the States of Holland and West Friesland closed the agitation by declaring that the Church had no concern with questions of banking. In the French Calvinist churches, the decline of discipline had caused lamentations a generation earlier. In America, the theocracy of Massachusetts, merciless alike to religious liberty and to economic license, was about to be undermined by the rise of new States like Rhode Island and Pennsylvania, whose tolerant, individualist and utilitarian temper was destined to find its greatest representative in the golden common sense of Benjamin Franklin. 'The sin of our too great fondness for trade, to the neglecting of our more valuable interests,' wrote a Scottish divine in 1709, when Glasgow was on the eve of a triumphant outburst of commercial enterprise, 'I humbly think will be written upon our judgment. . . . I am sure the Lord is remarkably frowning upon our trade . . . since it was put in the room of religion.'³⁸

What Tawney is actually saying here is that Calvinism, far from fostering and strengthening and reinforcing the spirit of capitalism, was itself suffering defeat as a prelude to being reshaped and altered and transformed by the development of the busy commercial spirit which it sought to restrain. What the record makes clear is that the Calvinist churches lost the power before they lost the will "to bind business within the discipline of Christian justice and charity."³⁹

The "loss of power" to place an effective restraint upon the temptations of avarice and ambition in commercial life is simply another way of saying that there was a breakdown of ecclesiastical discipline. Such a breakdown always occurs when there is a "waning of faith" in the community at large, but there may have been other factors which contributed to it and made Protestantism particularly susceptible to the crumbling of ecclesiastical authority.

Fanfani has suggested that fostering of religious toleration by Protestantism was one of these factors. Many Protestants, he notes,

were forced into exile, being "persecuted in their own countries" and "viewed with suspicion in their new ones," and "as a result of their misfortunes" became "fervent apostles of religious toleration and freedom—a fact of immense importance for the expansion of business, and highly prized by the capitalist."

It is indisputable that Protestantism, by immigration and otherwise, destroyed the unity of the State in the religious sphere and made its restoration impossible, so that King and subjects were faced with the problem of shelving the religious question in order to obtain such unity. Protestantism thus obliged the States to face the problem of freedom of conscience, which, advocated by authoritative Protestants, once solved, meant the removal of an obstacle to economic life and encouraged the tendency to count the religious question among the problems that could be left out of reckoning.⁴⁰

The role of religious toleration in the breakdown of ecclesiastical discipline is a much more complicated and debatable matter than Fanfani's discussion of it would make it appear, but this much is true: it did force religious bodies to rely upon the power of persuasion rather than upon legal coercion to maintain their influence in society.

There are two factors—one theological and one ecclesiastical—which may have been of greater importance in the assimilation of much of Protestantism to the model of the world. Theologically, Protestantism on the basis of its central affirmation can never make a claim to any unambiguous or infallible apprehension of divine truth, and thus it is more open to new currents of thought than would otherwise be true. Ecclesiastically, by largely destroying the distinction between clergy and laity, it placed its destiny to a very large degree in the hands of the whole body of the faithful rather than in a clerical caste which could more easily be subjected to discipline. Furthermore, this emphasis upon the priesthood of all believers tended in many Protestant denominations—whatever their ostensible polity—toward an exaggerated congregationalism which emphasized the autonomy of the local congregation and cancelled out the restraints which a larger ecclesiastical jurisdiction theoretically could maintain. This is a problem which has been inadequately investigated and which certainly demands urgent attention. It is not immediately apparent, however, that religious bodies with tightly-knit ecclesiastical control have always escaped accommodation to the spirit of the world. It would still seem to be true, therefore, that "the waning of faith" remains as the chief explanation of the relationship of religion to the rise of an uninhibited capitalist spirit in western society.

1. R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, pp. 212, 226, 316.

2. Ephraim Fischhoff, "The Protestant

Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism: the History of a Controversy," *Social Research*, XI (1944); reprinted in Robert

- W. Green, *Protestantism and Capitalism: the Weber Thesis and its Critics*, pp. 108-09, 113-14.
3. Tawney, *op. cit.*, 226.
4. *Ibid.*, 316; H. M. Robertson, *Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism*, pp. 52-56; Amintore Fanfani, *Catholicism, Protestantism, and Capitalism*, pp. 160-82.
5. R. W. Green, *op. cit.*, 30-34; Robertson, *op. cit.*, 4-7; Fanfani, *op. cit.*, 196, 200-04.
6. Fanfani, *op. cit.*, 186-87.
7. Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, p. 27.
8. *Ibid.*, 2.
9. *Ibid.*, 3, 160-63, 172.
10. Green, *op. cit.*, 107, 109, 112, 113.
11. A not untypical instance of manipulation is the way in which he handles Cromwell's request for legislation to reform economic abuses. Cromwell, after the battle of Dunbar, had written to the long Parliament: "Be pleased to reform the abuses of all professions: and if there be any one that makes many poor to make a few rich, that suits not a Commonwealth." Weber then adds the comment: "Nevertheless, we will find Cromwell following a quite specifically capitalistic line of thought," documenting this assertion by quoting in a footnote Cromwell's words of reproach to the Irish rebels—a reproach which was actually very conventional and might have been spoken by any ruler to rebellious subjects. By this means Cromwell's forthright request for legislation to curb an unbridled lust for gain is brushed aside. Weber, *op. cit.*, 82, 213.
12. *Ibid.*, 7, 10-11.
13. Green, *op. cit.*, 111. See also Fanfani, *op. cit.*, 160-82.
14. Weber, *op. cit.*, 155.
15. Tawney, *op. cit.*, 213, 226, 317.
16. Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, II, 649.
17. Tawney, *op. cit.*, 317.
18. *Ibid.*, 226, 227.
19. *Ibid.*, 240. "The first person to emphasize the way in which the idea of a 'calling' was used as an argument for the economic virtues was Weber, to whose conclusions I am largely indebted." *Ibid.*, 321.
20. *Ibid.*, 230.
21. *Ibid.*, 240. See Troeltsch (*op. cit.*, 645), who also traces "the present-day bourgeois way of life" to the Calvinist doctrine of the calling with its emphasis upon profit and gain as a sign of God's blessing.
22. Robertson, *op. cit.*, 1-7.
23. Fanfani, *op. cit.*, 204.
24. *Ibid.*, 192.
25. Baxter's views have been summarized in W. S. Hudson, "Puritanism and the Spirit of Capitalism," *Church History*, XVIII (1949), 8-14.
26. Fanfani, *op. cit.*, 153-54.
27. Weber, *op. cit.*, 60.
28. Troeltsch, *op. cit.*, 645.
29. Tawney, *op. cit.*, 226.
30. *Ibid.*, 225.
31. *Ibid.*, 103.
32. Fanfani, *op. cit.*, 202.
33. *Ibid.*, 178-79.
34. *Ibid.*, 197-99.
35. *Ibid.*, 210.
36. Tawney, *op. cit.*, 237-38.
37. Robertson, *op. cit.*, 22, 27.
38. Tawney, *op. cit.*, 238.
39. Robertson, *op. cit.*, 210-11.
40. Fanfani, *op. cit.*, 187-88.

COMMENT

LEO STRAUSS, *University of Chicago*

This meeting, I gather, is concerned with the need for reinterpretation. I am not at all certain that reinterpretation is a universal necessity, i.e., that there cannot be final or definitive interpretations especially in those areas of historical research which are the most important. But I cannot go now into this difficult theoretical subject. I must limit myself to saying that the call for reinterpretation is dangerous practically. That call tells the historian: be original! Originality is very rare and the original historians do not have to be told to be original. As for the large majority of historians, they merely get bewildered by that call. Every one of us is probably flattered by the implication that we could be original if we only tried. This implication draws our attention away from our simple and urgent duties, the duties to be careful and thorough and to think straight. It would be also a great delusion to believe that the demand for novelty has made us more receptive to novel approaches: the resistance to genuine innovations as distinguished from fads is today as great as it was in the most benighted ages.

Weber's *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* revolutionized the contemporary view of the past as much as Pirenne's studies on the end of antiquity or the beginning of the Middle Ages. I for one find the work of Pirenne more solid and even more exciting than Weber's. Yet Weber's work has a much greater fascination. For it concerns directly the way in which we as modern men understand ourselves, i.e., Weber's work is more philosophic than Pirenne's.

The broad phenomenon with which Weber was concerned was that of the origin of modern rationalism. Like almost everyone else, Weber traced it to the coming together of Greek science on the one hand and Biblical thought on the other. Weber's peculiar contention can be stated as follows. Jakob Burckhardt had ascribed to the Renaissance the discovery of man and of the world. He thus contrasted the Renaissance and by implication modernity as a whole with medieval other-worldliness. Yet what about the this-worldliness of pagan antiquity? What is the specific difference between modern and classical Greek this-worldliness?

A classical scholar comparing directly modernity with antiquity reached the conclusion that modern life is based on a fundamental asceticism. That classical scholar was Nietzsche; he set forth that

thesis in the third part of his *Genealogy of Morals*, entitled "What is the Significance of Ascetic Ideals?" Weber, we may say, was the first scholar who underwent Nietzsche's influence. Trained by Nietzsche, Weber saw the profound remoteness of the capitalist spirit from all "natural instincts," even from what we may call the natural vice of avarice.

Weber traced the capitalist spirit to Calvinism. What did he understand by the capitalist spirit? Two entirely different things. (a) The limitless accumulation of capital and the profitable investment of capital is a *moral duty*. (b) The limitless accumulation of capital and the profitable investment of capital is a sacred *end in itself*. Weber never proved that the second understanding of the capitalist spirit occurs in any serious writer. As for the first view, which does occur, the question arises: on what grounds is the limitless accumulation of capital etc. a moral duty? The authentic answer is: because it is conducive to the common good. Weber neglects this crucial point (the reference to the common good) as a purely utilitarian consideration and unimportant for his inquiry into the "irrational" source of the capitalist spirit. Because he was looking for such an "irrational" source, he was inclined to prefer definition (b). The problem of the genesis of the capitalist spirit properly stated is the problem of the emergence of this minor premise: the unlimited acquisition of capital is most conducive to the common good or to charity. The major premise which was not changed in any way by the emergence of the capitalist spirit was: it is our duty to devote ourselves to the common good or to be charitable. Weber did not succeed in tracing the minor premise to Calvinism proper; perhaps he found it in late Calvinism, i.e., in a Calvinism which had already made its peace with the world (Tawney)—with the *capitalist* world. Hence the emergence of the capitalist spirit cannot be explained by reference to Calvinism (Hudson 93-95). The general conclusion: one cannot trace the capitalist spirit to the Reformation.

But modernity begins not only with the Reformation, a transformation of the theological tradition, but also with the more or less contemporary and wholly independent transformation of the philosophic tradition. Weber wondered whether the origins of the capitalist spirit could not be found in the Renaissance. He answered that question in the negative because he thought that the Renaissance was the attempt to restore the spirit of classical antiquity, i.e., a spirit wholly alien to the capitalist spirit. Yet he failed to consider a fact of the utmost importance, namely, that *within* the Renaissance an entirely new spirit emerged, the modern secular spirit. The greatest representative of this radical change was Machiavelli and there is a straight line

which leads from Machiavelli to Bacon, Hobbes and other Englishmen who in various ways came to exert a powerful influence on "Puritanism." Generally speaking the Puritans were more open to the new philosophy or science both natural and moral than, e.g., Lutherans because Calvinism had broken with "pagan" philosophy (Aristotle) most radically; Puritanism was or became the natural *carrier* of a way of thinking which it had not originated in any way. By looking for the origin of the capitalist spirit in the way of thinking originated by Machiavelli one will also avoid an obvious pitfall of Weber's inquiry: Weber's study of the origin of the capitalist spirit is wholly unconcerned with the origin of the science of economics; for the science of economics is the authentic interpretation of "the capitalist spirit."

Surely, "the waning of faith" (Hudson 98) is a necessary condition for the emergence of the capitalist spirit but it is not its sufficient condition: the waning of faith is also the condition of the emergence of national socialism. The sufficient condition is the attempt at a new understanding of social reality—an understanding which is "realistic" in the sense that it conceives of the social order as based not on piety and virtue but on socially useful passions or vices.

SURVEY

EUROPEAN ARCHIVAL RESOURCES FOR THE STUDY OF CALIFORNIA CATHOLIC HISTORY

Many of the giants of American Catholicism were born in Europe and this is seen rather strikingly in the case of the American period of Roman Catholicism in California, which period dates from 1850. When, on December 6 of that year, a young Dominican friar, newly consecrated in Rome as Bishop of Monterey, arrived through the Golden Gate in San Francisco, he brought with him strong European traditions and background. For Joseph Sadoc Alemany, O.P. was born in Spain, as had been the founder of California's Catholicism, Junipero Serra. When other California prelates were appointed later on, they all shared such common European origins; Eugene O'Connell, Vicar Apostolic of Marysville and first Bishop of the Grass Valley diocese, was from All Hallows Seminary in Dublin while his successor, the "gold miner who became a Bishop," Patrick Manogue, was also born in Ireland. The two prelates who ruled the California Catholic church in the South, Bishops Amat and Mora, were both natives of Catalonia, as was Alemany. Add to the list of these captains of California Catholicism the many priests who came from Europe to serve in El Dorado and it becomes completely evident that one must become acquainted with their European background before discoursing too quickly about the American phase of their priestly apostolate.

At the annual meeting of the Catholic Historical Association held in St. Louis in 1956, the present writer formed part of a panel which discussed the "Status of Research in American Catholic History." I there ventured the remark that American ecclesiastical historians could never add the dimension of solid maturity to their work until the European sources for this story were conscientiously combed and

searched and the results were made known. In part, I was moved to this expression of a deep seated conviction by the publication in January, 1956, of an apposite article in MID-AMERICA (vol. 38, n.1.) entitled "Some Neglected Archives of Europe." The author, William L. Davis, S. J. of Gonzaga University, Spokane, had spent an impressive period of time in European archives, ecclesiastical and otherwise, and out of his fruitful searches had come much photographed material concerning Catholic origins in the Northwest. Father Davis' article confirmed me in what I knew, from private correspondence as well as from other sources, to be equally true concerning California Catholicism. No reader peruses Henry L. Walsh's "Hallowed Were the Gold Dust Trails, The Story of the Pioneer Priests of Northern California" (published in 1946) without becoming intrigued with the pioneer spirit of the Irish clergy who formed the major portion of the priesthood in California for so long and, therefore, from this as well as from other reflections, there was born in me the desire to flesh out the European aspects of the California Catholic story. If possible, I wished to photograph all available materials—e.g., letters and official reports, etc.—in the European ecclesiastical archives pertaining to the American period of California Catholicism. My ambition was to add these hitherto unavailable materials to the research holdings of the Gleeson Library of the University of San Francisco where they would be available for scholarly consultation and use. University authority sanctioned my desires and implemented them with a leave of absence of about eight months in 1957-58 and thus it was that I found myself on the eve of what promised to be (and was) a high ad-

venture, indeed. Here it is proposed merely to indicate some of the highlights of this archival hegira and to mention some of the more interesting fruits of the search.

Since 1842, its foundation year, All Hallows Missionary College in Dublin has sent over one thousand priests to work in various American dioceses and many of these have come to California—more notably, to the area now embraced by the present diocese of Sacramento. Correspondence with Kevin Condon, C.M., the archivist of All Hallows, had brought the satisfying (but not unexpected) news that the records of his College abounded in the sort of materials for which I was questing. As a result, the archives of the University of San Francisco are now enriched, together with other assorted items, with photographic copies of one hundred and fifty three letters written to and from San Francisco, 1851-1877, including some very informative letters of Bishop Alemany of Monterey (1850-1853) who, in the latter year became the first Archbishop of San Francisco, (1853-1884). We also have sixty letters of Bishop O'Connell of Marysville (1861-1868) and Grass Valley, (1864-1884), including a good number not found in Walsh as well as others which were supplied only in part to him for use in his book.

Eventually, other Irish seminaries were visited, all of which have sent priests to California, although not in the numbers reserved to All Hallows. Records were examined at St. Patrick's, Maynooth, as well as at St. Patrick's, Carlow, St. Kieran's, Kilkenny, St. John's, Waterford and St. Patrick's, Thurles.

Students of the period of which I here treat are conscious of the important financial contributions made to various American dioceses by the still important "Société pour la Propagation de la Foi" with offices in Paris and in Lyons. It was my good fortune to have made available to me the extensive correspondence and reports of various California prelates and priests preserved in the Paris headquarters of this

Society and I gathered some eight hundred pages of such important memorabilia in photographic form. These include some very detailed reports of Archbishop Alemany on the spiritual and material state of his flock and these, quite evidently, comprise a first class source of primary information in this regard. The Lyons records are still preserved in the episcopal archives of Fribourg, Switzerland, whither they were removed during World War II for safekeeping. I also found a rich yield there and became even more impressed by the solidity of the European background for which I was seeking. Paris also found me the recipient of gracious hospitality at the world headquarters of the Vincentian Fathers, the Daughters of Charity and the Helpers of the Holy Souls—and, in all of these, I came on materials relevant to my search. A visit to Namur in Belgium was profitable in examining archival origins for the important story of the Sisters of Notre Dame in their California historical phase.

From some years, a rather steady subject of search on my part had concerned itself with Archbishop Alemany, the Dominican friar who, as already mentioned, ruled the archdiocese of San Francisco with genuine distinction from 1853-1884. The Archbishop was born in Vich in 1814 and had entered the Dominican Order there in 1829; after the long years spent in America, he died in Valencia in 1888 with the request that he be buried in his ancestral city of Vich. Vich is an ancient Catalonian city about twenty miles from Barcelona and thither I journeyed in the company of the Archbishop's grandnephew, Antonio Alemany Comella, a man in his seventies and immensely proud of his archiepiscopal relative. My visit to Vich-Barcelona was made memorable by the presentation of a very rare copy of Don Antonio's "*Biografia del Ilmo. y Rmo. Fray Jose Sadoc Alamany Conill, O.P., Obispo de Monterey Y Primer Arzobispo de San Francisco de California.*" As far as I know, there is only one other copy in California today—that preserved in the Bancroft Library of

the University of California in Berkeley. Due to the wanton destruction of all archival materials in the Chancery of the diocese of Vich by the Spanish Reds during the Civil War, this volume is extremely valuable because it includes extensive quotations from these originals.

One of those whom I had consulted before leaving San Francisco had mentioned that it would be well if I endeavored to ferret out so-called "fugitive materials" on various earlier priests who served in California. An interesting Benedictine monk named Florian Schwenninger (1809-1868) had served in Siskiyou County in Northern California in the 1850's where he became affectionately known as the "Padre of Paradise Flat"—the latter place being a mining town which he made his headquarters. I had visited Padre Florian's grave in Marysville sometime previously and, with the help of a cooperative American Benedictine, had discovered that he had been a monk of the Abbey of Fiecht outside of Innsbruck in Austria. Correspondence with the present Abbot had established the fact that there were some letters of Padre Florian preserved in his monastery and hence I went to Fiecht where another cooperative monk had been engaged in transcribing these letters into modern German from the ancient German script in which Padre Florian had written them. These materials, since translated into English, have since formed the body of a research article the composition of which occupied me for some time. They tell much about the rigors of missionary life in Northern California in the Schwenninger years and, as such, comprise a first class addition of importance to the literature of the period.

Since all of the United States was missionary territory during the pioneer years which I have mentioned, it was evident that the archives of the Roman Congregation de Propaganda Fide should contain precious "official-

ia" in the field. I had reserved almost three months for work in these archives and others located in the Eternal City and these months will ever be memorable in my recollections of the entire archival tour. Contacts were made in Rome with the Archivists of various religious orders which concerned me and notable, in this regard, was the success which attended my efforts in the Passionist Archives there. Several of the Passionist Fathers had labored in California and Nevada and one, indeed, Father Peter Magagnotto, had been Alemany's Vicar General for a period of time; some of his correspondence was examined and later photographed for future use. But the main hope was that the materials preserved in the archives of Propaganda Fide would be made available, as well as those in the Vatican Archives. Contact with the latter depository eventually resulted (Rome does not move quickly and regards with a jaundiced and somewhat cynical eye those who suppose that it does) in the acquisition of over a hundred pages of photographed materials concerning the selection of the first Bishop of California, a Franciscan friar named Garcia Diego y Moreno (1785-1846) who was Bishop in California from 1840-1846. Despite the rigors imposed by certain Roman regulations well known to all who have worked in these archives, a fruitful search was made at Propaganda Fide of relevant materials and several hundred pages were added to the "Alemanyiana" collection as well as to numerous other facets of the American period of Catholicism in California.

It is not maintained that the European archival resources have been completely exhausted—to do so would require more time and the relaxation of certain regulations; however, as mentioned above, it is gratifying and constructive to know that an impressive amount of the available materials are now resident in San Francisco.

JOHN BERNARD MCGLOIN, S.J.
University of San Francisco

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

"The Negotiations of Clement VII and Francis I Concerning the Calling of a Church Council." By Wilfred Joseph Stiener. The Ohio State University, 1957.

A major issue of the pontificate of Pope Clement VII (1523-1534) was the question of calling a general church council to consider the Lutheran movement. Demands for such a council came from many sources, especially from the Emperor Charles V, whom historians generally have given credit for being one of the strongest promoters of the project. Opposed to the council were King Francis I of France and Pope Clement. It is the purpose of this study to determine the extent of their opposition and the reasons for it. The materials upon which the conclusions are based have been drawn largely from diplomatic sources. A special effort was made to refrain from involvement in doctrinal disputes and to consider only those issues which had a direct bearing on the council question.

The primary aim of Francis I was to further his dynastic ambitions. This led him, upon occasion, to support the Protestant princes of the empire or even the Turks. It also led him to consider the calling of a council from a political rather than a religious point of view. Since the calling of a council might conceivably lead to the solution of the Lutheran problem in the Holy Roman Empire and thereby strengthen his Hapsburg rival Charles V, he strongly opposed the council and took every opportunity to interfere with the plans for its convocation. The culmination of all his efforts may be seen in his communication with the German princes shortly after the death of Clement VII. In this communication he protested against the complaints concerning his opposition toward the council. Nevertheless, a thorough examination of the sources did not disclose any evidence of his support for the council. Even in the Marseilles meeting with the pope in 1533 he with-

held his approval of the project. While there is no direct evidence that this was his position, the absence of specific statements clearly indicates that no concession was made. If an agreement had been reached with the pope, he most certainly would have included such a statement in his correspondence with the German princes.

The reign of Clement VII is divided into two nearly equal parts: the period from 1523 to 1528 and the period from 1529 to his death in 1534. The years to 1528 appear as a period of confusion resulting from such events as the Battle of Pavia, the Sack of Rome, and the exile of the pope. During this period Clement was unable to turn his attention effectively to the question of a council. The more settled conditions in the latter half of his pontificate permitted him to give much more attention to this problem. His correspondence with Francis I is not extensive, but it is sufficient to indicate that papal influence had no effect on the attitude of the king.

After 1530 Clement was less concerned with political ambitions because of the restoration of his family to control in Florence. An increased attention to religious matters is evident in his consideration of the question of a church council in the years that followed. His desire to maintain the unity of Christendom necessitated the support of the major secular rulers for the council project. He was never able to gain the support of Francis in spite of extensive correspondence on this subject, the appointment of a special mission, and a personal conference with him at Marseilles. It was evident to Clement that without the approval of both Charles and Francis the convocation of a council would threaten the church with a schism. From the religious point of view this would be one of the greatest evils ever faced by the church. Clement chose not to call a council rather than risk such a threat.

By permission from *Dissertation Abstracts*.

"The Development of Politique Thought During the French Religious Wars (1560-1595)." By Edmond Morton Beame. University of Illinois, 1957.

The conception of the Politiques as a practical political party interposed between the Huguenots and the Catholics which, by divorcing reasons of state from religious considerations and devoting itself to the idea of the modern nation, saved France from the devastation of the Religious Wars has been accepted by most modern historians. While this view may be useful in part, its validity in studying Politique thought is limited. Actually the Politiques were not a political faction in the modern sense; attempts to define them as such have proved to be either replete with contradictions, incomplete, or inconclusive. They are best understood as an indistinct group of men united by their moderate natures and peaceful inclinations.

Politique thought grew out of the reactions of these men to the major issues of the Religious Wars. Foremost among the problems which held their attention was the question of toleration. In this their attitudes were conditioned by a tradition of Christian humanism and, to some degree, by Averroistic fideism. Their belief that inner faith was more important than outward ceremonies, that dogma was subordinate to living a Christian life, and that the basic aspects of religion inherent in man transcend individual sects, made them unable to persecute for religious reasons. Fideism pointed towards religious relativism, tended to direct religion inward, and denied a rational justification to religious persecution. The religious ideas of the Politiques guided them towards a policy of toleration, not as an end in itself, but as a first step towards eventual religious reunion.

Variation characterized the ideas of the Politiques concerning toleration. In the main they accepted the traditional Catholic theory that toleration of heresy was possible only on grounds of expediency, and they asked for it as a

means of preventing the ruin of the state by a religious conflagration. A few tended to consider toleration as an absolute good in itself, while others more conservative opposed outright toleration, but eschewed persecution. The Politiques' solution to the toleration question was the most distinctive element of their thought, and it provides the only certain criterion for identifying a Politique.

Although considerations of state also impelled the Politiques towards toleration, they cannot rightly be termed advocates of a modern idea of *raison d'état*. They showed at least an equal devotion to religion as to the state, and their conception of the state was that of the medieval *Respublica Christiana* with its dual nature of terrestrial government and religious society. A nonmoral state was foreign to their thoughts. The Politiques were men of the Reformation period, and their ideas were more medieval than modern.

In reaction to the particular issues of the Religious Wars the Politiques developed political theories that are significant for the history of thought. Against the attempt of the Papacy to interfere in the French Church and kingdom they drew upon a Gallican tradition, infused it with conciliar ideas and theories of the divine right of the king to administer the church, and evolved the most complete expression of French independence from papal control advanced at any time during the Ancien Régime. As royal supporters against the Holy League and the Papacy they enunciated a theory of divine-right monarchy which contained contradictory elements of absolute power and a limited sphere of action for the king. Finally, when the cause of royalty and legitimate succession seemed threatened by efforts to dethrone Henry IV they emphasized the inviolable nature of the fundamental laws of the kingdom, especially that of the Salic law.

By permission from *Dissertation Abstracts*.

"Liberal Catholicism in France, 1843-1870." By John Keith Huckaby. The Ohio State University, 1957.

Two separate groups of Catholics in France between 1815 and 1870 attempted to reconcile the Roman Catholic Church with post-Revolutionary Liberalism. The first of those groups, the one headed by Lamennais, was condemned by Rome in 1832. The second, with which this study is concerned, formed itself around the leadership of the Count De Montalembert and Henri Lacordaire, former disciples of Lamennais, and the Abbé Dupanloup and Frédéric Ozanam. It had as its immediate purpose after 1843 the modification of the *Université* monopoly and the realization of liberty of education. This second Liberal Catholic movement adopted a program similar to Lamennais'—freedom of religion and conscience, freedom of speech and press, parliamentary government, a dualism in Church-state relationships, as well as the immediate demand for liberty to teach. In short, they asked for liberty for the Church under the "common right," and they sought the reconciliation of the Church with modern society which was based on the precepts of Liberalism.

By the Falloux law of 1850 the Liberal Catholics achieved the right of Catholics to open schools freely, subject to state supervision, which they had not opposed. The larger problems involved in the proposed rapprochement between Catholicism and Liberalism were not so easily solved, however. Allowed increasingly less latitude by Rome and faced with the Liberals' anticlericalism, the relatively small group of Liberal Catholics worked at a pattern for Church-state relations compatible with both Catholicism and Liberalism. The Montalembert group proposed "a free Church in a free state," meaning the mutual independence of the two institutions—a dualism short of a pluralistic separation. In the final analysis they came as close to a pluralistic concept as did the secular Liberals,

who were not prepared to divorce the state completely from some particular set of moral values. Liberty of conscience and religion were proclaimed by the Liberal Catholics in spite of the encyclical of 1832, *Mirari vos*, and the Syllabus of Errors. These papal encyclicals, they said, condemned such liberties only when advocated as concrete and absolute ideals. To maintain a cloak of orthodoxy they distinguished between the ideal of a wholly Catholic society which would obviate the need for toleration, and the multiplicity of religions which actually existed and which made freedom necessary.

Originally Ultramontanes of the first order, the Liberal Catholics became increasingly hesitant to proclaim the omnipotence of the pope almost in direct proportion to the degree to which the papacy attempted to dictate political and social philosophy. They assumed a right to independence in political matters; after the Syllabus of Errors they were outspokenly opposed to infallibility, a position which they held at the Vatican Council. They cannot be identified with Gallicanism, however, for they eschewed the Gallican formula for Church-state relations. Their differences with the papacy notwithstanding, they championed the cause of papal temporal sovereignty in the face of Italian demands for unity.

In political outlook the Liberal Catholics corresponded best to secular Liberals. They feared democracy and republicanism, in which they recognized a radical social threat. They championed parliamentary government and the usual civil liberties, and they opposed the Empire of Napoleon III. Economic Liberalism did not intensely concern them, for their orientation was such as to make it of secondary importance to them.

In the final analysis the skepticism of Liberals and the reactionary policies of the papacy prevented a reconciliation between the Church and modern Liberal principles. The sincerity with which the Montalembert group of Liberal Catholics accepted the precepts of Liberalism was nonetheless real, de-

spite the fact that they were Catholics first and only secondarily Liberal.

By permission from *Dissertation Abstracts*.

"The Reception of Darwinism in the United States, 1859-1880." By Edward Justin Pfeifer. Brown University, 1957.

When the *Origin of Species* appeared (first English edition, 1859; first American, 1860), its reception in the United States had been prepared by scientific and religious condemnations of previous evolutionary schemes. Louis Agassiz, the most famous scientist then in the United States, led the opposition, while Asa Gray was Darwin's earliest and most effective advocate. In debates in 1860 and 1861 Agassiz failed to squelch Darwin's ideas, though not until after the Civil War did American science swing noticeably in Darwin's favor. Agassiz's influence steadily declined and by 1873, when he died, most American scientists were evolutionists.

Religious thinkers originally were largely against Darwin too, since they felt that his system amounted to atheism. Influenced by Paleyan theology most of them felt that God, to be God, must directly govern His own universe. Since Darwin attributed the formation of species to natural selection, while Paley attributed them to divine intervention, theologians often accused Darwin of substituting natural selection for God. Opposition to evolution as contradicting the Bible was of much less importance. On this score some denominations, notably the Presbyterians, even preferred evolution to Agassiz's polygenism. As scientific support for Darwin grew, religious thinkers worked out reconciliations. To do so they usually developed the arguments that evolution itself required a God behind it and that the processes of evolution themselves testified to a designing mind.

Some writers, however, were adamantly against Darwin. One was Charles Hodge, of Princeton, who insisted that Darwinism was atheistic.

Those willing to interpret Darwinism theistically warned of the danger of Hodge's position and clung to their own position in spite of the realization that enemies of religion were arguing for materialism and atheism on the basis of evolution. Controversies growing out of addresses by John Tyndall, Thomas H. Huxley, and Simon Newcomb only made the theistic evolutionists hold more strongly to their position.

They received scientific support from various quarters. Richard Owen, Alfred R. Wallace, and Saint George Mivart, all well known English scientists, published works that the theistic evolutionists found useful. They also received support from the Neo-Lamarckians, a group of evolutionists who developed in the United States. The most prominent Neo-Lamarckians were Alpheus Hyatt, Edward Drinker Cope, and Alpheus S. Packard. They held that environmental hardships caused hereditary organic change. Unlike Darwin they believed that evolution was orthogenetic. This made the argument from design easier to sustain. By relegating natural selection to a role of secondary importance the Neo-Lamarckians opened the door to a theistic interpretation of the evolution.

The upshot was that by 1880 religious thinkers, drawing what support they could from science, had carved out a position that they called "Christian evolution." Christian evolutionists interpreted evolution as a process attesting to God who, they felt, intervened in Nature to endow man with a soul. They avoided Biblical conflict by surrendering the doctrine of verbal inspiration. They based the atonement not on a primitive fall from grace, which seemed difficult to sustain, on evolutionary principles, but on the prevalence of sin in the world. Not every Christian was willing to accept this doctrine but in every denomination some members did. A reconciliation had thus been worked out between Darwinism and religion, though often by the modification of Darwin's ideas.

By permission from *Dissertation Abstracts*.

"The Life and Work of Phineas F. Bresee." By Donald Paul Brickley. University of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Bresee was born in Franklin, New York, December 31, 1838, and died November 13, 1915, in Los Angeles, California. He was a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church for 37 years, having served as pastor of some of the largest churches in the Iowa and the Southern California Conference. During this period of his life he was twice Presiding Elder and twice elected to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He also served as a member of the board of directors of educational institutions of the Methodist church, during his years as a minister in that denomination.

On the first Sunday of October, 1895, Bresee formed a mission for the poor of Los Angeles. He gave two reasons for the mission, first, that the gospel might be preached to the poor who did not generally feel welcome in the more fashionable churches; second, that he might have opportunity to preach the doctrine of entire sanctification. Entire sanctification is defined as that act of God, subsequent to regeneration, by which believers are made free from original sin, or depravity, and brought into a state of entire devotion to God, and the holy obedience of love made perfect. Bresee lived in a period of controversy over this doctrine that was national in its effect.

The mission was called the Church of the Nazarene. During the first two years five other groups desired to have missions established in their towns, which Bresee organized and supervised in the role of superintendent. As the number of churches grew too large for his personal supervision, he inaugurated a plan of district superintendents for each area and himself acted as general superintendent.

In September, 1902, Bresee founded a school for the training of leaders and preachers for his growing denomination. He had plans to make the school an outstanding university with a full schedule of studies in all branches of education. The school he founded is now called Pasadena College and is a fully-accredited college with an enrollment of 849. Bresee served as president of the school until 1911.

During this period there were ten or more groups in the United States that were founded around the issue of the doctrine of entire sanctification. Bresee founded and edited a weekly paper called the *Nazarene Messenger*, to publish the message of his church throughout the United States. He had a strong desire for the union of all the holiness groups into one church and worked to that end in his editorials and preaching tours. He was a leading figure in the union movement which resulted in more than half of the above-mentioned groups uniting to form the present-day Church of the Nazarene. It was through his preaching and writing of charity in nonessentials and his definite emphasis on the need for union that the several groups of holiness churches from New England, New York, Texas, and the Southland united into one church.

His work in the beginning critical days of the University of Southern California and his founding of Pasadena College were noteworthy contributions. He was primarily interested in the culture of the soul as against the development of the intellect and was more of an administrator than an educator, yet he set in motion educational agencies that have influenced generations.

As founder of the Church of the Nazarene, he gave to the world a new denomination that is now world wide in its ministry. The effect of such an organization cannot be measured.

By permission from *Dissertation Abstracts*.

"The Mission Compound in Modern China: The Role of the United States Protestant Mission as an Asylum in the Civil and International Strife of China, 1900-1941." By Gladys Robina Quale. University of Michigan, 1957.

The purpose of this study is to assess the significance for China of the safety found in United States Protestant missions by Chinese subjects during periods of warfare between 1900 and 1941.

Part One describes the development of the treaty clauses under which United States Protestant missions existed in China, together with their modification in practice; the growth of the prestige granted by Chinese to United States Protestant missions because of the protection given them by Chinese and American officials; the attempt made by Chinese to use that prestige for their own purposes; and the measures taken against this practice by United States Protestants in the years preceding 1911.

Part Two delineates the rise and decline of the use of mission enclosures as asylums during the rebellions, wars, and revolutions of 1911 to 1928. In the first part of this period all who were inside the walls of United States Protestant missions were left unharmed, for experiences in the years treated in Part One had discouraged the Chinese from injuring foreigners and what pertained to them. The rise of modern nationalism and the influence of Soviet propagandists in the renascent Kuomintang diminished the position of power held by Westerners in China until approximately 1925. Since the increased anti-foreign activities of the mid-1920's provoked no response on the part of the West comparable to the international punitive expedition of 1900, armed Chinese ceased to leave unmolested those of their fellow-countrymen who fled to mission compounds.

Part Three depicts the revival of the inviolability of United States Protestant missions in the struggle between Japan and China. From 1937 to 1941 mission properties were again able to

shelter Chinese in combat areas, for they belonged to citizens of a powerful nation which was not yet an active participant in the Far Eastern conflict. However, the entry of the United States into World War Two and her subsequent relinquishment of the treaty-granted privileges held in China by her citizens ended the ability of the United States Protestant missions to offer asylum because of their foreign ownership.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the study. 1) The capacity of United States Protestant missions to harbor Chinese during wartime depended upon the degree of awe felt for Western power by those who were disturbing the peace of China. 2) The effectiveness of the shelter given to Chinese by United States Protestant missions therefore varied with the physical security accorded by the Chinese to Westerners in general, which in turn was dependent on the relative strength of China and the West. 3) The recognition by missionaries of the close association between the safety of their enclosures and China's fear of retaliation by Western governments for any harm done to foreigners forced upon United States Protestants a continual struggle with the dilemma of whether or not they ought to use their connection with the United States for the preservation of Chinese lives. 4) United States Protestants therefore exerted themselves to avoid favoring one class or group over another in the protection they afforded to Chinese. 5) The realization by Chinese of the relationship between Western might and mission inviolability was a factor in the resentment against foreign privileges which led in the 1920's not only to China's insistence upon treaty revision but to the success of the Kuomintang. 6) During the war with Japan, Chinese accepted the special position held by United States Protestant missions because their humanitarian services assisted the nation and its people against a foreign invader.

By permission from *Dissertation Abstracts*.

BOOK REVIEWS

St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch. By VIRGINIA CORWIN. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960. xiv, 293 pp. \$5.00.

It is a constant temptation to expect classical Christian writers to answer our questions instead of discovering what their own questions were. Ignatius of Antioch has suffered particularly from such treatment, since his interests in doctrine and polity lie so close to the area of later controversies. Professor Corwin's study happily escapes this danger by close attention to the letters themselves in the context of their own time. A careful analysis of Ignatian theology and ethics is introduced by an equally careful treatment of "The Situation"—the man and his letters, Antioch and its Christians, and the factions in its Church. Rightly, I think, Miss Corwin accepts the traditional view that the docetists and Judaizers were different groups. The latter, she suggests, may have had some connection with the Qumran Sect, whose Teacher of Righteousness is perhaps glanced at in Ignatius' reference to Christ as "our only teacher" (*Magnesian* 9:1). However, this conjecture, while suggestive of another possible factor in the interplay of spiritual forces in first-century Antioch, scarcely justifies later references to "Essene-Christians" as a proved phenomenon. This section is helpfully illustrated by maps of Syria, of Antioch, and of Ignatius' journey across Asia Minor.

Miss Corwin is certainly right in rejecting the views of scholars who have interpreted Ignatius as a devotee of mysteries or a crypto-Gnostic rather than placing him in the main stream of Christian development; and equally in finding that he was acquainted with Matthew and I Corinthians, probably also with the Fourth Gospel and the Odes of Solomon. The weakness which I find in her study

derives from its very meticulousness—the detailed analysis of words and ideas makes it seem at times as if Ignatius were compiling a *theologisches Wörterbuch* rather than composing letters to young Churches at a moment of crisis. One misses some of the drama and excitement which run through the Ignatian letters, the record of the "apostolic and prophetic teacher" (as Polycarp was later called and Ignatius might have been) who would on occasion be moved to cry out in the Church "with a loud voice, the voice of God" (*Philadelphians* 7). While Ignatius' general line of thought is clear enough, one cannot insist that his brilliant phrases are to be read as technical terms with a precise meaning. It seems to me, at least, that Miss Corwin weakens rather than strengthens Ignatius' pregnant idea of the power of divine stillness by taking it in the formal sense that the Father is *Sige*, an interpretation based on the one passage where Ignatius speaks of the Logos as coming forth from silence (*Magnesian* 8:2). The mysterious silence of Christ is probably more than "the passive side of Jesus' life," but it need not exclude that as one of its expressions (p. 121). In thought as in action unity is the central passion of Ignatius (to which one might add reality), and for him concrete event and mystical significance are not to be separated. Ignatius' understanding of Christian truth and Christian living is built around great central convictions, as Miss Corwin so well brings out. Her book is in the best sense of the word a valuable introduction to the Ignatian letters, and will enable the student to read them with a fuller awareness of the "acute intelligence and profound piety" (p. 271) which inspired their message.

EDWARD ROCHIE HARDY
Berkeley Divinity School
New Haven, Connecticut

The Council of Florence. By JOSEPH GILL, S.J. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959. 453 pp. \$8.50.

The importance of Professor Gill's treatment of the ecclesiastical Council of Florence (1438-39), that last and most significant attempt to heal the schism between Latin and Greek Christendom, lies in large part in his utilization of certain basic sources hitherto unpublished or considered too biased to be of genuine historical value. Besides the pro-unionist *Acta Graeca* and the Latin account of Andrea of Santa Croce, Father Gill, Professor of the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, has made extensive use of the neglected memoirs of the anti-unionist Byzantine ecclesiastic Silvester Syropoulos, until now known largely in the old and faulty Latin translation of the anti-Catholic R. Creighton. As Father Gill rightly realizes, these memoirs, biased as their tone admittedly is in favor of the Greeks, are valuable in that they provide us with a unique picture of what went on behind the scenes within the 700-man Greek delegation at Ferrara-Florence.

Another virtue of the book is the craftsmanship with which the complex and often controversial material is put together, with the theological detail being placed in a context of political and social factors. The author has not hesitated to state as a major thesis the fact that more than any other single consideration it was the success (however temporary) of Pope Eugenius IV in achieving union with the Greek church that enabled the papacy to triumph over its deadly enemy, the conciliar movement. Gill shows with acute insight that in the interminable arguments between the two sides over the *filioque* and other theological problems the Greeks were distrustful of and often vanquished by the extensive Latin use of the Aristotelian dialectic which had been perfected in the Western universities. One doubts, however, in this connection whether the Greek representatives were really

convinced emotionally as well as intellectually of the truth of the Latin position. Otherwise how satisfactorily to explain the subsequent unyielding Greek opposition to the union on the part of the mass of the Byzantine population? One can hardly doubt, furthermore, what the Greek attitude to union would have been had there been no such severe pressures on the Byzantines (i.e., the Turkish danger to Constantinople) to come to terms with Rome. Gill's objectivity with respect to both Latin and Greek sides is revealed in his forthright picture of the Greek disdain for the Western church as a result of the tenth and early eleventh century condition of the papacy, and his (correct) explanation of the Western view of union as simply a *reductio* (a "bringing back") of the Greek church to Rome rather than a real merger of the two bodies. Accurate is his judgment that, in comparison to the Latins, the Greek prelates, except for Isidore, Bessarion, and Mark of Ephesus, were generally unlearned. Commendable too is the author's sympathetic portrayal of the Greek Patriarch and Emperor, of Pope Eugenius and Mark of Ephesus, and the writer's insistence that the root cause of the Great Schism in the West lay in "the abasement of the papacy, its worldliness and simony." We may note, finally, his support, however cautious, of the correctness of many of Syropoulos' statements, such as for example the fact that the papal subsidies for the support of the Greek delegation were at one juncture five months in arrears—a point to be balanced by Gill's explanation that the pope was then in bad financial straits.

Though Father Gill deserves much credit for helping to "rehabilitate" Syropoulos as a source, and has gone far in seeking to understand the Greek mentality of the period, he has neglected to develop the theme of the Greek fear of Latinization which, in the view of this reviewer, was one of the basic factors underlying the Greek opposition to the union and which helped to make the Greeks so in-

transiently attached to the dogmas and formulae of their church. For the tenacity with which they supported their dogmatic positions often really masked and was symptomatic of other deeper considerations. In other words the Greeks feared, through union with the Latin church (i.e., subordination to the papacy), to lose their own national identity. It is in this connection of ethnic pride that another explanation can be offered of the incident at Ferrara in which the Greek patriarch refused to kiss the foot of the pope.

Though more emphasis could have been given to the underlying feelings of the Greeks in their resistance to union, there can be no doubt that this admirable book is the most complete and authoritative treatment which has appeared on this famous Council. As such it should be read by all medieval historians as well as those seeking a solution to the problem of establishing some sort of union, or at least "unity," among the churches of modern Christendom.

DENO JOHN GEANAKOPOLOS

University of Illinois

Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation. By GEORGE H. TAVARD. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959. x, 250 pp. \$5.00.

Father Tavard's clear-cut thesis can be briefly stated. "The theology of the first centuries took one point for granted: the authority of the Church's tradition and that of Scripture are not two, but one. Holy Writ and Holy Church are mutually inclusive. This conception of Christian authority dominated the mind of the Fathers and of the medieval theologians" (p. 244). Such factors, however, as extravagant papalism among canonists, conciliarism, and nominalistic speculations, undermined the coherent pattern of orthodoxy, and Humanists and Reformers faced an antithesis between Scripture and Tradition. Some theologians saw the need for a renewed synthesis, but many set-

tled for either a one-sided ecclesiasticism or an exclusive biblicism. While the Council of Trent (accompanied at least part way by early Anglican divines) returned to the classical conception, the major Counter-Reformation writers, influenced by the "dualistic" notion of Tradition as a doctrinal source parallel to Scripture, failed to appropriate its solid achievement. As a concerned "ecumenist," Tavard undertakes a fresh historical analysis of this critical issue of the Reformation era.

His narrative is somewhat uneven. The sketchy documentation of the crucial opening chapter on "The Patristic View" is not altogether compensated for by the fuller treatment of "The Medieval Outlook" that follows. The discussion of "Seeds of Discord" in later medieval theology depends for much of its material on Dom de Vooght's *Les sources de la doctrine chrétienne*, while later chapters draw on Ullmann, Geiselman, and others. On the other hand, an impressive amount of research is embodied in the very full presentation of the sixteenth century itself, and the book as a whole is an able synthesis.

While the late Middle Ages undoubtedly witnessed the kind of disjunction that Tavard describes, his account of the process may well be incomplete. Could it not have been the whole medieval development of the papacy, and not just certain exaggerations, that threw the pattern of orthodoxy off balance? Can we not trace a tendency, fostered by the insistent canonists, to assimilate doctrinal formulations to legislative and judicial acts, and consequently to posit a doctrinal sovereign within the Church? Can it not be suggested that such new factors cast doubt on the identification of the Tridentine definition with the patristic doctrine under so vague a rubric as the "coherence of Church and Scripture" (p. 244)? Tavard speaks disparagingly of "analytic artifices that create antagonism between elements that are organically joined" (p. 80), but complex organisms will exhibit functional

diversity, and it is not clear that the early Fathers and Trent saw the respective functions of Scripture and Church in the same light, or that a conception of their coinherence dominated by the appeal to "apostolic tradition" is even very close to a view controlled by "the Catholic concept of development" (p. 238). In fact, one may suggest that a certain imprecision in the use of theological ideas conceals a considerable oversimplification of theological history, although one must go on to repeat that both Tavad's own detailed research and his attempt to sketch its wide historical and theological context give his book a distinctive value.

Several details call for remark. Tavad's account of the formation of the New Testament Canon (p. 5) unjustifiably stresses the "common experience" of the "power of the Word" in the reading of certain books, to the neglect of the Fathers' concern with apostolicity. No doubt "*Eruditio Didascalica*" (p. 17, n. 5) and "*Desideratus Erasmus*" (p. 76, n. 1) are misprints, but the reference to Erigena's great work as "*De Divina Natura*" (p. 12, n. 1) seems rather slipshod. The *Enarrationes in Apocalypsim* attributed to Anselm of Laon (p. 17, n. 4) probably belong to an early thirteenth-century writer, and Otto of Lucca should replace Hildebert of Lavardin at p. 19, n. 1. These minor slips do not, of course, affect the substance of Tavad's argument, but they are unfortunate in a work of exact scholarship.

EUGENE R. FAIRWEATHER

Trinity College,
University of Toronto

Studia nad Arianizmem. (Polska Akademia Nauk. Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii.) Edited by LUDWIK CHMAJ. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1959. 563 pp., 27 illustrations. zł 90.

Like the movement itself, the scholarship dealing with Polish Antitrinitarians has always had a marked international character. The book un-

der review, a collection of papers published in connection with the three-hundredth anniversary of the expulsion in 1658 of Polish Brethren, bears this stamp as well: in addition to Polish we have here contributions from Denmark, Hungary, Italy, Switzerland and the USA, and while most papers are published in Polish and provided with English summaries, the reader has to switch occasionally to English, German and Italian.

The book is divided into three parts. The first deals with personalities. Konrad Górski gives a remarkably clear and well thought-out exposition of the evolution of the religious ideas of Frycz-Modrzewski, an important Polish social and religious thinker. T. R. Castiglione discusses the persecution of Valentino Gentile in Calvinist Geneva in 1558. Antal Pirnát's paper, entitled "*Jacobus Palaeologus*," deals in fact only with the Transylvanian period (1570-75) of the life of the Greek reformer, on which, however, thanks to the author's discovery of codices with Palaeologus' manuscript works, it manages to throw new light. Lech Szczucki's paper is a study of a hitherto little known minister and polemicist in Lithuania, Licinius Namyslowski. The late Ludwik Chmaj, the editor of the whole volume, analyzes the main ideas of Socinus' Raków lectures. Two minor contributions, one by K. E. Jordt Jørgensen on Lubieniecki in Cracow in 1655, and another by Ladislao Łaszloczly, a short biographical sketch of A. Lachowski from Moskorzów, conclude this part.

The second part, "Problems," is the most important of the whole book. G. H. Williams of Harvard, in a well-documented paper, stresses the importance of the hitherto neglected Anabaptist strand in the pre-Socinian phase of Polish Antitrinitarianism. Alodia Kawecka-Gryczowa's study of "The Printing Presses of Cracow and Raków in the Service of Antitrinitarianism," a model of thorough scholarship, is the closest approximation to and, let us hope, a forerunner of, the so much needed bibliography of Polish

Antitrinitarian publications. Stanislaw Tyne's "The Polish Brethren's College in Raków" outlines the history of the famous school.

Stanislaw Przytkowski was obviously in a difficult situation while writing his paper on the studies of Polish Brethren in mathematics and physics: the paper, addressed to a non-specialist audience, had to be popular of necessity and at the same time had to satisfy the demands of a scholarly publication. One cannot, unfortunately, say that the author managed to reconcile successfully these conflicting demands. Zbigniew Ogonowski's "The Faith and Reason in the Religious Doctrines of the Socinians and John Locke" is to a large degree a convincing polemic against the views of Delio Cantimori who was playing down the import of Socinus in the history of religious rationalism. It is a pity that the author somehow overlooked H. McLachlan's *The Religious Opinions of Milton, Locke and Newton*, which is pertinent to his discussion. The last paper of this part, by Janusz Tazbir, analyzes the position taken by Polish Brethren in the Swedish war, 1655-1660, and the part the war played in their expulsion from Poland.

The book is concluded by the publication of new Latin source material presented and masterfully introduced by Henryk Barycz and the editor himself.

All in all, this is a valuable publication, rich in new ideas and data, and is, perhaps, the most important in the field after the appearance in 1946 of the first volume of E. M. Wilbur's *A History of Unitarianism*.

WIKTOR WEINTRAUB
Harvard University

Listy (Letters). By FAUST SOCYN (SOCINUS). Edited by LUDWIK CHMAJ. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1959. Two volumes.

Recently, through the efforts of the Polish Academy of Education in Warsaw, there have appeared all the here-

tofore uncovered letters of Faust Socyn. It is the first edition written in the Polish language, since all the previous ones were published in Latin. This collection is particularly noteworthy since it contains many letters just discovered, which were unpublished in previous editions. Faust Socyn was a very prolific letter writer; however, a large majority of his works have disappeared. Walenty Szmalc had preserved approximately 200 of his epistles, but, unfortunately, the majority of these were also lost. Although most of his letters were written in Italian, the first publication was printed in Latin, and published most likely by his friend Walenty Szmalc, in 1618 in Raków, Poland. Later, other letters were also published in Latin, in Poland and also in Holland, in 1656. To the previously published letters there have been added 13 letters, which have been found in Rumania, Italy, and other countries. Two of these are copies of original letters which are preserved in Cluj, Rumania. In this edition there are letters which have been written not only by Socyn himself, but also letters written to him, by many of his friends. His correspondence includes many letters which were written to his Polish Brethren and others written to many of his friends in other countries. Many of these are merely short personal notes, while others are large discourses upon religious matters, and are practically treatises in themselves, covering in length over 60 pages. For example, the letter written to Jan Niemojewski is a 68 page debate on Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

This edition of the letters has been arranged in chronological order, translated from the original Italian or from the first Latin edition. Likewise, each letter is accompanied by an explanatory footnote, which greatly facilitates understanding the text. Also, there is, at the beginning, a short biography of Faust Socyn, written in approximately 1631, by the well known writer of the Polish Brethren, Samuel Przytkowski, and published in 1634, in Latin, anonymously. It has been translated into

many languages, and was published in the English language in 1651. This volume of the letters of Faust Socyn is a valuable source of historical documentation of the reformation. It reveals a true picture of the religious ideas in Polish territory, which was the cradleland of the free religious movement which is today called Unitarianism.

JOSEPH ALLEN

*The First Parish Unitarian
Hubbardston, Mass.*

Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559. By CARL S. MEYER. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960. viii, 182 pp. \$4.95.

Dr. Carl S. Meyer of the Concordia Theological Seminary has provided college and university students with a brief, and on the whole admirable, introduction to the Elizabethan Settlement of religion, that critical synthesis between the old and the new order which provided foundations for Anglicanism that have endured for four centuries. The first six chapters of the book tell again the familiar story of the events of the first months of 1559, when by the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity the Settlement was made. Here Dr. Meyer shows commendable dependence upon Sir John Neale's recent indispensable studies of Elizabeth's parliaments. His treatment of the material and his comments upon the character of the Settlement make refreshing reading for Anglicans who are more accustomed to explore their heritage from within their own tradition than under the guidance of an eminent Lutheran historian. Dr. Meyer rightly insists that Elizabeth's own convictions are integral to the nature of the Settlement, and in seeking to determine them he raises the question, which one could wish he had pursued further, of the influence of Melancthon's thought upon Queen Elizabeth. While in these first chapters the story of the Settlement is outlined accurately enough, the discussion of its nature, and the policy of the Queen and her

government which it incorporated, would have been, perhaps, more penetrating had Dr. Meyer made significant use of the Canons of 1571, the Queen's Defense of Her Proceedings, the Latin Prayer Book, the first Elizabethan Primer, and other documents which bring light to bear upon the interpretation of the Settlement embodied in the two parliamentary acts.

The last three chapters of Dr. Meyer's book are less valuable than those which precede them. Chapters vi and vii suggest briefly the relations between the Elizabethan Church and Romanism on one hand, and Puritanism on the other. While enough may be said in a few pages to indicate the main lines of conflict between Elizabethan Anglicanism and recusancy, the complexities of the problem cannot be adequately presented. This is even more true in respect to Puritanism, where Dr. Meyer lacks the space to discuss the onslaught that was mounted against the Settlement from the side of Geneva from 1570 to 1590, and the character of its attack against the established Church. It might be said that, except for the early vestiarian disputes, Dr. Meyer has ignored the defense of the Settlement against Puritanism—a serious omission in so far as the character of the Settlement itself is illuminated by an examination of the precise points of Puritan attack.

The final chapter of the book is something of an appendix—an analysis of the XXXIX Articles and their theological ancestry, with particular respect to possible Lutheran influences. Here again Anglican readers will find some refreshing comments from the Lutheran point of view.

Despite omissions, however, Dr. Meyer's book will be useful for the purposes he intends. Assign it with J. V. P. Thompson's *Supreme Governor* to expand the story of the defense of the Settlement and the two chapters on the Church in A. L. Rowse's *The England of Elizabeth* to suggest some of the problems gently but in depth, and the student will have an excellent

introduction to the Settlement of Queen Elizabeth I.

P. M. DAWLEY

The General Theological Seminary

The Calas Affair. Persecution, Toleration, and Heresy in Eighteenth Century Toulouse. By DAVID D. BIEN. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960. 199 pp. \$4.00.

In his attempt to prove that Jean Calas' conviction for the murder of his son, by the parlement of Toulouse in 1762, was an atypical incident in a situation in which tacit tolerance of Protestants was the rule and not the exception, Professor Bien has created a problem for those who, like Voltaire, have accepted the contention that Jean Calas was merely one in a long line of martyrs who suffered as a direct result of the French Government's championship for nearly a century of the adamant stand of the Catholic Church on what it regarded as the Calvinist heresy. Not only does he present the Roman Catholic parlement and populace of Toulouse in a new light, he also notes that the Protestants, especially the urbanized ones, far from being so dedicated to their cause that they willingly defied the Catholic Church and the French Government for the sake of their religious beliefs, were in fact compromising right down the line. They complied with the law in matters of baptism, marriage and even burial—protecting their property first, and apparently relying on predestined salvation for their souls.

Ever since the eminent Calvinist historian, Professor Émile-G. Léonard, began his fruitful research into the nature of "bourgeois" Calvinism, which he found to be lukewarm in its attitude toward religious practices, the re-examination of French Protestant history has been going steadily forward. Although Professor Léonard, nor refer to any of his numerous books and articles in his bibliography, he, like others writing in this field, is heavily indebted to him.

This is a study in social psychology, with the drama of the unsolved murder of Marc-Antoine Calas deliberately pushed into the background and the larger issues of the eighteenth century social, political and economic scene brought forward for examination and evaluation. The author maintains that by the 1760's overt hostility between Protestants and Catholics had practically disappeared due to religious indifference on both sides. Why, then, should the parlement of Toulouse have condemned a man, highly respected in the community, largely on religious grounds—with the apparent approval of the local populace? Professor Bien attempts to explain this seemingly contradictory action by presenting in some detail the political basis of the attitude of the parlementaires toward Protestants, as well as the reasons why an anti-Protestant emotional storm could be stirred up among the people in 1762.

First there were the penal laws against Protestants which, though seldom enforced, were still on the statute books as a constant reminder that Protestantism and lawlessness were synonymous. Also the parlementaires tended to see the individual Protestant as a member of an autonomous group, in much the same way that they saw the Jesuits as part of a corporate body beyond the jurisdiction of secular authority. As far as the populace was concerned, it was not religious fanaticism that set off anti-Protestant hysteria in the early 1760's, but rather the tensions created by unsuccessful war (in which France was pitted against two Protestant states) and an accompanying depression, especially severe in the Garonne valley. These factors generated a feeling that the state was in danger and a tendency for the people to look for enemies in their midst.

In their overwrought state of mind the people in the vicinity of Toulouse had been panicked by rumors of a Protestant attack in 1761, when the Pastor Rochette was arrested and condemned to execution, along with others of his faith, by the parlement of Tou-

louse. Professor Bien emphasizes that just as the parlement and people viewed Rochette as a representative of "organized" Protestantism and therefore a threat to the community and the state, so they viewed Calas' alleged murder of his son as his compliance with a decision by "organized" Protestantism as to how to deal with defection from its ranks. Add to these factors the harsh criminal procedure in eighteenth century courts, where the objective seems to have been conviction and severe punishment as a deterrent to crime, and you have the ingredients of the *cause célèbre* of the century.

This is an approach which the twentieth century student finds full of meaning as he attempts to unravel the complex social and political corrosives at work in the *ancien régime* in France. That it would have made little sense to Voltaire may be taken for granted, and that the old *philosophe's* broadside against the parlementaires, contemptuously classifying them as bigots, was an effective weapon to employ in the 1760's would seem to be proved by the information Professor Bien includes in his penultimate chapter which shows the change in atmosphere, practice and law in Toulouse after 1762. He credits this to the rapidly spreading enlightenment, but surely that movement was no impersonal force and Voltaire's role should not be minimized.

This is an excellent study, not the least of its merits being the author's fresh approach and his provocative re-evaluation of a much written-about incident which he characterizes as an anachronism in eighteenth century France. There is, however, an omission that I regret. He minimizes, in fact, practically omits consideration of the role of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, not only in the Calas case but as a corporate body "anachronistically" vigilant in its attempt to force the French Government to apply the penal laws against the Protestants through 1789.

MARGARET MAXWELL

Finch College.

The Political Thought of John Henry Newman. By TERENCE KENNY. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1957. 208 pp. 21/.

Although there has been some interest in Newman's political views and opinions in recent years, no extensive or systematic study of them has been attempted up to this point. This neglect is due, on the one hand, to the anomalous position of Newman in modern thought. Since Newman's death, the emphasis in both Protestantism and Catholicism has shifted from dogmatic and institutional concerns to the social and political dimensions of Christianity. Thus, Newman's relative disinterest in political and social questions has isolated him from the main stream of contemporary Christian thought. Moreover, his conservative role in nineteenth century politics has often been a source of disappointment, if not embarrassment, to modern Catholic liberals. The second and more serious reason is the fact that Newman neither wrote a political treatise nor left any systematic account of his political opinions comparable, for example, to the *Apologia*. The risk involved in reconstructing his political thought from inconclusive fragmentary evidence has been a strong deterrent to such a study.

The latter problem has been somewhat (though not entirely) mitigated by Professor Kenny's discovery of a wealth of new sources relating to Newman's political views and opinions in the manuscript collection of the Birmingham Oratory—no major political treatise, but a large number of heretofore unavailable letters, sermons, notebooks, journals and other miscellaneous fragments. The significance of this new material, Kenny maintains, is that it so enlarges the substance of Newman's political thought that a revision of current judgment on the subject is possible, if not mandatory. Thus, in the opening sections of the book, he dispels the popular image of Newman as a "crabbed Tory" or reactionary and undertakes an analysis of the theological and philosophical bases of

Newman's conservatism: his Augustinian view of man, his non-metaphysical concept of the state, and his position on the relation of church and state. Kenny successfully shows that Newman's conservatism rests upon profound intellectual and moral convictions rather than upon mere party sentiments or socio-economic Tory prejudices. Moreover, he argues that Newman's rejection of the liberal creed (optimism, rationalism, progress) does not automatically entail opposition to practical liberal policy or objectives. In short, Newman's political thought contains both a conservative element and (at least potentially) a liberal element.

In tracing the liberal strain in Newman's political thought, Kenny relies heavily on new evidence, particularly the correspondence with T. W. Allies, in order to demonstrate that Newman, as a result of his disillusionment with Erastianism as well as his keen historical realism and British practicality, came to accept the modern secular state. Throughout this section, Kenny's objective is to build upon Laski's insight that there is an "implicit liberalism" in Newman's thought and to find some explicit basis for it. Such evidence is found in Newman's statement to Allies: "I do not see my way to hold that 'Catholic Civilisation,' as you describe it, is in fact (I do not say in the abstract), but in fact, has been, or shall be, or can be, a good, or *per se* desirable" (p. 134). Realizing the difficulty of portraying Newman as an out-and-out liberal, however, Kenny endeavors to soften his argument by using phrases such as "a form of liberalism" (p. 154), "close to being a liberal" (p. 162), and "a kind of liberalism" (p. 192) to describe Newman's position. Notwithstanding such qualifications, the case for Newman's liberalism is overstated and weak since it amounts to little more than the acceptance of the "neutral, tolerant State."

Yet the discussion of how Newman came to this conclusion is enlightening and convincingly worked out. The

most rewarding section of the book deals with Newman's idea of the state in contradistinction to both St. Augustine and St. Thomas. Unlike Augustine, Newman does not begin with the notion of the "two cities" as separate, but accepts the historical fact that the Church is in the world and rejects the notion of withdrawal or separation as unrealistic. Thus, Newman "had actively to face the situation and to come to terms with it" (p. 155). The philosophic basis of Newman's opposition to political liberalism was its denial that religion was the necessary social bond of society. Though Newman was compelled to accept the modern secular state, the acceptance was without illusion: neither art (as Arnold suggested) nor knowledge (as Brougham felt) were satisfactory substitutes for religion.

Another illuminating aspect of the study is the careful examination of the methodological difference between Newman's thought and Thomist natural law theory. Newman's non-metaphysical approach to politics, like his epistemology, was devoid of scholastic assumptions and wholly a result of his strong commitment to the British empirical tradition. This difference not only led Newman to conclusions at variance with Thomist political thought, but made it easier for him to adapt himself to the thought of his time ("he was closer in many respects to the general political thought of his fellow countrymen at that age than he was to many great contemporary thinkers of his own Church," p. 107). Perhaps Kenny will in the future give explicit attention to Hume's influence upon Newman, which, in my opinion, accounts for the fundamental cleavage between Newman and neo-scholasticism.

Professor Kenny's effort to weigh and balance the conservative and liberal elements in Newman's thought gets out of hand in the final section of the book and leads him to disregard his own principle that "as long as his political position is correctly understood, the choice of label to describe that position is unimportant" (p. 127).

The last chapter ends on an unfortunate apologetic note—a defense of Newman's aristocratic temperament, his preference for intellectual and theological issues over socio-political ones, and his reluctant acceptance of universal suffrage. This not only introduces a false objective into the work, but detracts from the substantive sections where Newman's ideas are presented and analyzed in and for themselves.

KENNETH F. LEWALSKI
*Massachusetts Institute
 of Technology*

William Nast, Patriarch of German Methodism. By CARL WITTKÉ. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1959. 256 pp. \$4.95.

The author of this biography is professor and chairman of the department of history and dean of the Graduate School of Western Reserve University. His special historical interest has been the field of German immigration to the United States, where a number of significant publications have established his authoritative status. Included are a number of biographies such as those of William Weidling and Karl Heinzen to which is now added this venture into the religious field—a persuasive example of how, in weaving thematic strands into the basic biographical plot, good biography is more than biography in the statistical sense and becomes required reading for historians and sociologists alike.

Fourteen chapters (to which are added a section of Notes and an Index) set the biographical course from the birth of Nast in Swabian Stuttgart in 1808, through his American career which began with his arrival in New York at the age of twenty-one, to his death in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1899. He was baptized and confirmed in the Lutheran Church, brought up in the austere tradition of Swabian pietism, later to be affronted by the rationalism of his teacher, F. C. Bauer, and his fellow student, D. F. Strauss, as well as by Lutheran orthodoxy and confessionalism. Thus the stage is set for

the projection of various antithetical factors in the unfolding of his American career as a pioneer German Methodist preacher and "Missionary to the Germans" on the western frontier (C.4), editor of the *Christliche Apologete* (C.7,8), "A Bridge Between Two Continents" (C.9), "College President" (Wallace) (C.10), and as "Theologian and Author" (C.11). These and other chapters dealing with "The Early Years of German Methodism" and the illuminating discussion of the unique characteristics of German Methodism as "An Immigrant Church" depict both the facile adjustment of this scholarly German-trained theologian to the American scene and the equally fascinating story of the rise and development of German Methodism on American soil.

Altogether, this biography presents a new chapter in the story of the Americanization of German immigrants in the nineteenth century. An excellent perspective is given to the tensions between the basic positions which English, American and German Methodists held in common and the variable forms of their American expression. The account is strewn with examples of the persistence of native German temperament and social customs and of the legacy of German Protestantism (Lutheranism, pietism, etc.) in relation both to American Methodism and to the American religious spirit (Puritanism, etc.). Not all of these tensions were easily resolved.

In this connection we note, among other things, Wittké's reference to Nast's concern about the unusual excitement generated at Methodist camp-meetings. German Methodists on the whole, were more insistent than the Americans about the literal application of the Discipline. Some questions may remain concerning Nast's basic attitude toward the espousal of temperance, amusements, observance of the Sabbath, the use of tobacco, etc. How significant were apparent deviations from the American patterns? Was it a part of the "freedom of the Christian man" that, as a German

Protestant or enlightened pietist, he enjoyed his pipe and glass of wine—the medicinal properties of which were not minimized? Nast may have found himself in hearty accord with a German pietist of his day that a Christian could read the Bible with a cigar in his mouth. The predilection of the reviewer for studies in this field may have unduly colored his appreciation for this vivid biography of a man who stood in the midst of the German immigration movement of the nineteenth century.

Although the author does not propose an ordered discussion of the issues involved in the Americanization of German religious leaders or of German immigrant churches and their religious traditions, one is attracted to the projection of this theme into wider aspects of German-American research—in which the professional church historian may be stimulated by his colleagues in the secular historical and sociological fields. The time may be ripe for more incisive and definite studies of outstanding German religious leaders of the nineteenth century and of the religious traditions they represented from the perspective of their response to situations and challenges of the new world—an important chapter in the story of American culture and religion. The Americanization of Nast and the German Methodists may reveal aspects as similar as they are different from the "Americanization" of K. F. Walther (or S. S. Schmucker, although American-born) and the Lutherans, Philip Schaff and the Reformed, Joseph Rieger and the Evangelicals, or August Rauschenbusch and the Baptists—all contemporaries of Nast. In this light the biography of this patriarch of German Methodism may point to the rise of a new genre of studies which may more precisely delve into the Americanization of German immigrant churches.

An occasional slip of the brush does not mar the central portrait as, for example, the strange reference to "Dr. Philipp Schaff, distinguished Lutheran

theologian," (p. 95)—a reference which may not particularly edify either Lutheran or Reformed readers.

CARL E. SCHNEIDER
Webster Groves, Mo.

The Mormon Conflict 1850-1859.
By NORMAN F. FURNISS. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960. 311 pp. \$5.00.

President James Buchanan was in no mood for conciliation in May, 1857, the second month of his administration. The Mormons in Utah Territory, by acting disrespectfully toward certain unpopular Federal officials, were "in a state of organized and open rebellion against the laws." After pondering the Mormon menace thoroughly, the President determined that only through a demonstration of military might and the replacement of rebellious governor Brigham Young with an officer more amenable to Federal authority could Utah's disorder be sufficiently isolated and prevented from marring the fabric of an already divided Union. The army which Buchanan belatedly sent to Mormon country found its route to the Basin blocked by hostile Saints and winter snows. Before spring thaw the Mormons saw the futility of armed resistance and indicated willingness to acknowledge the authority of the new Buchanan appointee, Governor Cummings. Thus Buchanan upheld Federal prestige while avoiding unnecessary bloodshed. It is in this suggestive vein that Norman F. Furniss of Colorado State University details the blustering, blundering and occasional bravery which composed the Mormon War, and analyzes the intentions and achievements of citizens, Saints and soldiers.

The book is well done in some respects. Humor and judicious fairness are joined in its measurement of the events and personalities which made up the episode. It corrects some Mormon misconceptions as to Buchanan's reasons for dispatching the army to Utah and then circumscribing its employment. It clarifies the role of

Thomas L. Kane in smoothing Gentile-Mormon differences short of war. It enumerates carefully the points of enduring tension between the two peoples. But the book seems directed toward disproportionate ends. While it treats an incident of some national import (judging from the newspaper attention it received in all sections of the nation, pp. 62, 75, 78) it consciously draws attention away from the "dramatic steps leading up to the Civil war" to examine "other occurrences of the 1850's." The aim is to study one "critical phase of the Mormons' early history" thereby revealing Mormon "beliefs, their manner of behavior, their virtues, and their shortcomings" (pp. vii-viii). The result of this handling is a consideration of certain aspects of Mormon conduct divorced from the basic social trends of the period. What might have made a provocative study of the growing conflict during the fifties between nationality and locality becomes largely a cataloging of the personal imperfections of prominent Mormons and Gentiles. In this process some of the significance of the affair is lost. An era was coming to a close. The free-wheeling religious experimentalism of the thirties and forties which had nurtured the growth of Mormondom's peculiar institutions was being squeezed into conformity by the forces of national consolidation. It was not apparent to the Mormons of the mid-nineteenth century that via Buchanan's forceful exhibition they had taken their first long stride toward the twentieth. Unfortunately the fact was not driven home to them until twenty-five years more had elapsed and Federal officials again had to resort to the use of force to make the Saints meet the standards of the new age. Unfortunately, also, the fact is not made as plain as it could be in this work.

MARVIN S. HILL

Chicago

The School of the Prophets. The Background and History of Augustana Theological Seminary 1860-

1960. By G. E. ARDEN. Rock Island, Ill.: Augustana Theological Seminary, 1960. xi, 280 pp.

This centennial history of Augustana Seminary has 266 pages of text. The organization of the seminary is first mentioned on page 112. The preliminaries of any historical study are significant. But when they have been told many times before, judicious economy can be employed. As it turns out, what is presented here as "the first definitive and comprehensive history of 100 years of theological education in the Augustana Lutheran Church. . ." (from the Foreword) has largely been told before too, in one form or another. The result is anything but definitive.

From page 112 on, the author, professor of church history at Augustana since 1945, charts the development of the school largely along chronological lines. We are told about the humble beginnings in Chicago (1860), the abortive move to Paxton, Ill. (1863), and the latest move to Rock Island (1875); the six presidents are mentioned *seriatim*; faculty members are introduced and hurriedly sketched in certain cases; a few well-worn anecdotes concerning student life in the various eras are interspersed along the way. All of this, of course, belongs. But beyond this obvious material, one could also wish to find a fuller treatment of the theological position of the school and its foremost leaders (e.g., C. E. Lindberg's confessionalism, and Conrad Bergendoff's ecumenical emphasis), a deeper analysis of the "Augustana spirit," plus a franker discussion of some of the more controversial personalities and issues.

Above all, it would have been good to see here a bit more about the "prophets" trained at this institution. We are given numerous details about "the school," but very few about its product. I am under the impression that one of the best ways of measuring the worth and the influence of an educational institution is in the light of the impact and the accomplish-

ments of its graduates. This particular touchstone is not brought to bear here, and the book suffers as a result.

Furthermore, it becomes increasingly apparent as the story wears on that we have here a good illustration of the "polite" history-writing genre: many pertinent and interesting facts have been omitted, obviously on purpose, lest someone be offended. Thus, e.g., when President Olof Olsson died in 1900, Arden writes concerning his successor that "it was natural that the choice fall on this energetic, 37 year old scholar"—Gustav Andreen. Well, so it did, eventually, but the fact of the matter is that Andreen was the second choice for the position (President C. A. Swensson of Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kan., received and rejected the call before it was issued to Andreen). Again, we are told that after the 1930-31 school year four professors "retired from their posts and accepted calls to various congregations." This is an innocuous way of saying that these men severed their ties with the seminary, but there is more to the story. One of the four was only 34 in 1931, and he has now taught in another Lutheran seminary for nearly 20 years; obviously he did not "retire." The latter years of the school's history are also treated very gingerly. Conrad Bergendoff's heroic attempt to forestall the separation of Augustana College and Seminary, finally accomplished in 1948, is sketched all too briefly and colorlessly.

It must be borne in mind, of course, that this book was written to aid in the centennial celebration of the Augustana Church and its one and only theological institution. This implies, among other things, that it was written to be sold to a rather broad and unsophisticated public. Such facts do make for extenuating circumstances—perhaps beyond the control even of the author himself.

GENE LUND

Concordia College
Moorhead, Minn.

The Lutheran Church Among Norwegian-Americans. By E. CLIFFORD NELSON and EUGENE L. FEVOLD. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960. 800 pp. Two-volume boxed set, \$12.50.

When on January first of this year The American Lutheran Church came officially into being, that phenomenon of American church history known as Norwegian-American Lutheranism ceased to be. The constituent synods of the new organization were of German, Danish, and Norwegian origin. The history of the former American Lutheran Church (German) was recently written by Fred W. Meuser. In *The Lutheran Church Among Norwegian-Americans* E. Clifford Nelson and Eugene L. Fevold, both of whom teach church history at Luther Theological Seminary in St. Paul, have teamed to present a thorough study in two volumes of the Norwegian contribution to the new synod of two million members.

Marcus Hansen's comment was more than an aphorism: what the second generation of immigrants wishes to forget, the third generation wishes to remember. Nelson and Fevold have remembered and researched well, and each has the advantage of having written a doctoral dissertation (Yale and Chicago respectively) in Norwegian-American church history. Here are writers of undoubted mastery of the sources, excellent method, and literary skill.

Volume I begins with a solid treatment of the theological and religious situation in Norway before and during the decades of emigration. Fevold's historical judgment in these chapters is excellent as he gives us balanced accounts of Haugeanism, Grundtvigianism, and the Johnsonian Awakening. More might have been said about Carl Paul Caspari, who was nearly as significant a figure to many of the emigrating pastors as Johnson. A minor point of criticism: Fevold's overuse of semicolons and of the word "however."

The remainder of Volume I deals with the several synods which were formed between 1850 and 1890, when

the first major union of synods was accomplished. In these chapters one sees clearly the viewpoint of the authors, and of Nelson in particular: whatever contributed toward organizational union in the history of those bodies is "good"; and whatever seemed to hinder union is "bad". Hence the theological stringency of the Norwegian Synod, with its affiliation with the Missouri Synod, is excoriated as "orthodoxism" and "fundamentalism". When Nelson remarks in his Preface to Volume II that objective detachment and perfect response to Ranke's demand for "what actually happened" are impossible, he is of course correct. Yet his slanted account of the Norwegian Synod and of Missouri influence betrays an emotional subjectivity which should by all means have been edited out. To evaluate a Christian body so largely on the basis of polemics is simply bad history; and to apply the one test of the furtherance of outward union is also to do injustice to what actually *did* happen. Nelson came to his task with inflexible judgments, and his adjectival editorializing, while it lends color and readability, reduces the stature of the entire work.

Perhaps there is too much preoccupation with theological and synodical warfare throughout the study. Admittedly, the course of Norwegian-American Lutheranism has not run smooth, and honesty requires even from a sympathetic writer a full account of the many struggles which engaged the immigrant church. Nevertheless the smell of battle is too much over these volumes. The real work of the Church of Jesus Christ on earth, while militant indeed, is not and was not civil war among its small parts. Rather, militancy means and meant advance through missionary work, hastily sketched, and soul-care within the congregations, virtually ignored.

Theologically, Nelson gives the Norwegian-American Lutherans of the past and of the present two and only two alternatives: what he repeatedly refers to as fundamentalism (though

there was no such thing at the time of which he writes, especially in Volume I), and Erlangen theology, centered in J. C. K. von Hofmann's *heilsgeschichte* view of Scripture. Conceding the richness of Hofmann's hermeneutical insights, it is an egregious over-simplification to limit most of American Lutheranism's theology to mere repristination, equated with orthodoxism and legalistic confessionalism, on the one hand, and Erlangen theology on the other. That the doctrine of the Word has always been a major area of American Lutheran theological attention cannot be denied. Yet Nelson's analysis and synthesis proceed from a caricature of the orthodox position of such men as Walther and Koren.

In the last chapter of Volume II, "The Church Discovers Other Churches," Nelson sketches the twin courses of Erlangen "catholic" confessionalism and of Repristination "orthodoxist" confessionalism throughout the twentieth century, and briskly—at times brilliantly—makes his historical judgments clear. The history of Norwegian-American Lutheranism is viewed as a series of political and strategic operations, with organizational unity up to and including full ecumenical involvement his chief criterion of ecclesiastical success. Thus the short-lived American Lutheran Conference and even the new American Lutheran Church are seen by implication to be unfortunate defensive alliances based upon a repristinating theology. Evidently Nelson believes that the less said about the most dynamic one-third of American Lutheranism, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, the better.

While these volumes, in this reviewer's judgment, require a critical re-editing, they will no doubt remain the standard and only substantial history of more than a century of vital Norwegian-American Lutheranism. The dean of American Lutheran historians, Theodore Tappert, has commended Nelson and Fevold for their "exceedingly readable and informative account . . . which should serve as a

model of judicious and ecclesiastical historiography." To Nelson and Fevold is certainly due the gratitude not only of the members of The American Lutheran Church, who may now learn more about the rock from which they were hewn, but also of many others who have begun to recognize that American church history may not be confined to the Protestantism of New England and of Revivalism.

GERHARD L. BELGUM

Luther College, Decorah, Iowa

The Protestant Search for Political Realism, 1919-1941. By DONALD B. MEYER. Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1960. x, 482 pp. \$6.75.

Seven years ago, an earlier form of this work appeared as a Harvard doctoral dissertation, with a title significantly different from its present one: "The Protestant Social Liberals in America, 1919-1941." The historiography of the Social Gospel for the years between the two World Wars can be summed up in the difference between these two titles: from a focus on "social liberals" to a focus on "political realism." That is to say, from the perspective of 1953, the problem of evaluating the post-Rauschenbusch Social Gospel was one of tracing the extension of certain religious and political ideas from the Populist and Progressive Eras forward into the '20's and '30's—ideas which can be classed, both theologically and socially, as "liberal." But from the perspective of 1960, the problem was one of relating these ideas to what was coming next: a situation in which the word "liberal" would be rather less relevant in describing what was happening, and the word "realist" rather more so.

These comments should not leave the impression that this is simply one more Niebuhrian tract in the guise of a monograph. Meyer always presents Niebuhr in counterpoint to men whose approach to social reform (both in theory and in practice) was radically different from Niebuhr's; most frequently, and most strikingly, the coun-

terpoint is to Kirby Page and Harry F. Ward. Furthermore, although Meyer is sympathetic with what neo-orthodoxy was trying to do, he is in no simple sense a "Niebuhrian." He is, if anything, Tillichian, with a strong dash of *Richard Niebuhr*; where he does follow Reinhold, he finds it "necessary to insist somewhat vehemently" upon a side of Niebuhr that is often overlooked, sometimes by Niebuhr himself (p. 296).

For Meyer, Niebuhr's thought remains inconsistently politicalized; and the same tragic flaw occurred more consistently in Niebuhr's contemporaries in the '30's. What the Christian social prophet must confront and criticize in America, more than politics, is culture; the proper poles for a Christian social critique are "concrete man" and "abstract society" (pp. 279, 298). Paradoxically, for Meyer the final Christian political insight is into the danger that politics, by identifying individual with social ethics, may dehumanize Man: "The final upshot of the social gospel was that the gospel had to be more personal." (p. 285). It may be noted that a very similar shift has been taking place in such secular humanistic fields as literary criticism, without benefit of neo-orthodoxy; Meyer is conscious of this, though he does not labor the point, with the result that this book not only clarifies much in American church history but also illumines the dilemmas of the contemporary secular liberal intellectual.

In a work of this scope there are bound to be mistakes and overstatements, mostly picayune. It is not true, for example, that Southern Methodist leader James M. Cannon as of the year 1941 had "never been among the social prophets" (p. 361); the Bishop's most unsympathetic biographer, Virginius Dabney, concedes the contrary. Again, "direct and specific" confrontation of social issues during the '20's by such denominational papers as the *Baptist*, the *Churchman*, and the *New York Christian Advocate* are by no means "unknown" (p. 53), as Robert Moats

Miller has exhaustively demonstrated. But this sort of slip is inevitable in a study which covers so much ground and synthesizes so much of what it covers. Again, the book can be criticized for omissions: the word "ecumenical" does not appear until rather late in Meyer's argument (p. 330—and there only in the context of a discussion of John C. Bennett, where it is scarcely avoidable!), although it appears to me that the rationale of Christian social concern cannot be fully understood without some reference to the

Ecumenical Movement. But these objections are secondary. What is far more important is that Professor Meyer has re-thought the *ethos* of the 1920-40 Social Gospel—or, to use his own illuminating preferred term, "the social passion"—so profoundly that his work at once supersedes all previous published studies of American Protestant social thought in that period, including those of R. M. Miller, J. Neal Hughley, and the present reviewer.

PAUL A. CARTER
Montana State University

ACTIVITIES AND PROJECTS*

In 1962, soon after the completion of this current volume of *Church History*, a complete author, title, and subject index of the journal will be published covering the entire thirty-year sequence of issues. The enterprise will be subsidized by funds available for publication of the journal. Members and interested parties, however, are invited to make advance subscription and pay a nominal charge of \$1.00 to help cover costs. Orders with checks for \$1.00 for each copy should be sent to the Treasurer of the Society, Guy S. Klett, 520 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania.

The Polish Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii in Warsaw announces the publication in March, 1961, of a *Bibliography of Reformation* from 1945 to 1960. It will contain all publications in Poland on the history of the Reformation. All requests for this bibliography should be made to Lech Szczucki, Polska Akademia Nauk, Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii, Warszawa, Palac Kultury i Nauki, piętro X, Poland.

Announcement has been made of a long-term project for the publication of a new standard edition of the works of John Wesley. Dr. Frank Baker, visiting professor at Duke University, is one of several scholars in several Methodist theological seminaries who are engaged in the preliminary phases of planning this first full edition in over

one hundred years. Especially valuable will be the new editions of the many works not included in the standard editions of the *Journal*, *Letters*, and *Sermons*.

The Lancashire Parish Register Society, one of the senior Lancashire antiquarian societies, will publish its 100th volume this year (1961). The Society was founded in 1898. The Society has tried to distribute its volumes evenly over the county. With one exception—Leyland, 6 of whose 14 registers have been printed—none of the Hundreds is represented by less than 10 volumes and three are represented by 16 or 17. The three earliest registers, dating from 1538, have been published. Attention paid to earlier registers has meant that of those beginning before 1600 only 8 are unpublished. But there remain 17 unpublished registers beginning between 1600 and 1700 and over 90 beginning in the 18th century. The Society also has a library of transcripts of Lancashire registers compiled by members.

Further information concerning the Society may be obtained from the Hon. Secretary, Dr. F. Taylor, The John Rylands Library, Manchester 3, England.

*Brief announcements of forthcoming events and projects of major research and publication and reports on work in progress will be welcomed. Personal notices on individual research and book notices should not be sent. Please send suggested copy to F. A. Norwood, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois.

